



THE  
CATHOLIC  
Doctrin  
of the  
EUCHARIST

Written in  
French by the Learned  
M. Claude.

*Veritas saligari potest,  
vinci non potest. Ethor  
& Beal.*

1683.

Ἐποικοδομῶν δέντες ἐπὶ τῇ θεμελίῳ  
τῆς Αποδόλων καὶ Περὶ τῆς ὄντος  
ἀποροῦναι αὐτὸ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἔδωκε.  
2.20.





47  
F. 8.2  
THE

Catholick · Doctrine  
OF THE  
**E U C H A R I S T**  
In all A G E S:

In ANSWER to what  
M. ARNAUD, Doctor of the *Sorbon*  
Alledges touching  
The BELIEF of the *Greek, Moscovite, Armenian,*  
*Jacobite, Nestorian, Coptic, Maronite,*  
AND OTHER  
**E A S T E R N C H U R C H E S.**

Whereunto is added an Account of the  
Book of *the Body and Blood of our Lord,*



Published under the Name of

**B E R T R A M.**

In Six BOOKS.



**L O N D O N:**

Printed for R. ROYSTON, Bookseller to His most  
Sacred Majesty, at the Angel in *Anen-Corner*, MDCLXXXIV.



1707-08

71-1704



---

TO THE  
RIGHT HONORABLE  
AND

RIGHT REVEREND

FATHER in GOD,

HENRY

Lord Bishop of LONDON,

AND

One of His MAJESTIES most Honorable

PRIVY-COUNCIL, &c.

J. R. R.

Humbly Dedicateth this TRANSLATION.

TO THE

RIGHT HONORABLE

AND

RIGHT REVEREND

FATHER GOD

HENRY

LONDON

AND

of the most honorable

CLERK, &c.

AT

THE CHURCH OF ST. MARTIN

To the Worthy Gentlemen  
The MINISTERS, and ELDERS of the  
CONSISTORY, Assembled at Charenton.

Gentlemen, and my most Honored Brethren,

THE design of the Book which I here offer you, being chiefly to invalidate those pretended proofs of *Perpetuity*, wherewith men would set up such new Opinions as alter the purity of the *Christian Faith* touching the Holy *Eucharist*, I have therefore reason to believe that this present Treatise will not prove unacceptable to you; for altho the Religion we profess, needs not the hands of men to support it, no more than heretofore the Ark of the *Israelites*; yet have we cause to praise God, when we see that Reproach, of departing from the Ancient Faith, may be justly retorted upon them, who charge us with it. Ye will find here in this Discourse a faithful and plain representation of things, such as they are in truth, in opposition to every thing which the Wit of Man; and the fruitfulness of Human Invention have been able to bring forth to dazle mens Eyes and corrupt their Judgments: As soon as ever I had read the Writings of these Gentlemen whom I answer, the first thought that came into my mind was that of Solomon, *That God made man upright, but he had sought out many inventions.* And indeed, what is plainer than the Supper of our Lord, as he himself has instituted it, and his Apostles have delivered it to us; and what can be more preposterous than to search for what we ought to believe touching this Sacrament, amongst the various Opinions of these later Ages and different Inclinations of men; and especially amongst them, who are at farthest distance from us: These remote ways do of themselves fill us with doubts and suspicions, and the bare proposal of them must needs disgust us, and make us draw consequences, little advantageous to the Doctrins which these Gentlemen would Authorize. Yet I have not refused to joyn issue with them on their own Principles, as far as the truth will permit me; and if they would read this Answer with a free unprejudiced mind, I am certain that they themselves will acknowledg the contrary to what they have endeavoured to persuade others.

I here offer you then Gentlemen, and my most Honored Brethren, this last fruit of my Labor: first, for your own Edification, and secondly, for a publick testimony of my Respect and  
a know-



5

---

*The Author's Epistle Dedicatory.*

---

acknowledgments. All that I do, or have done, is justly due to you, not only upon the account of the Right which ye have over me and my Labors, but likewise because it is partly from your good Examples that I have taken, and do still every day draw the motives which strengthen me in the ways of God and in the love of his Truth. It is in your Holy Society that I learn the Art of serving the common Master of both Angels and Men, according to the purity of that Worship, which he hath prescribed us, and at the same time, how to work out my own Salvation as well as that of others. And indeed what is it, that a man cannot learn in an Assembly, wherein all hearts and minds do unanimously concur in the practice of Piety and Charity, which consists of persons who have no other aim, but so to order their Conversations, as to draw down thereby the Blessings of Heaven upon themselves and the people whom God hath committed to their Charge, and render themselves worthy of the protection of our great and Invincible Monarch. This Work would have been published sooner, had it not been for three great Losses we have suffered by the Death of Mr. *Drelincourt*, Mr. *Daillé*, and *Morns*; three names worthy to be had in everlasting Remembrance. These persons have left us so suddenly one after another, that we have scarcely had time to bewail each of 'em as much as we desired: The loss of the first of these extremely afflicted us; the loss of the second overwhelmed us with Sorrow; and the Death of the last stupified us with Heaviness. God having taken to himself these three famous Divines, it was impossible but this work should be retarded. But being now at length able to Publish it, I therefore entreat you Gentlemen, to suffer me to Dedicate it to you, that it may appear in the World honored with your Names. May the Father of Lights, from whom descendeth every good and perfect Gift, enrich you more with his Graces, and preserve your Holy Assembly, and the Flock committed to your care: These are the ardent Prayers of your most Humble and Obedient Servant and Brother in Christ Jesus,

CLAUDE.

---

THE

---

# THE P R E F A C E.

**T**HE Dispute which the first Treatise of the Perpetuity of the Faith hath occasion'd on this Subject of the Eucharist, has made such a noise in the world, since Mr. Arnaud's last Book, that I have no need to give an account of the motives which engage me in this third Reply. Besides, it is evident to every one, that the Cause which I defend, and which I cannot forsake without betraying my Trust and Conscience, obliges me necessarily to state clearly matters of Fact, and maintain or refute those Doctrins which are debated between Mr. Arnaud and me.

**A**N D yet whatsoever justice and necessity there may be for publishing this Work, I am afraid some persons will be displeased, seeing so much written on the same Subject; for this is the sixth Book since the first Treatise of the Perpetuity has been publish'd, besides two others of Father Nouet's and mine. And these Tracts which at first were but small, have since insensibly grown into great Volumes. Yet for all this, we have not seen what Mr. Arnaud, or his Friends are oblig'd to produce as to the first six Centuries, of which without doubt much may be said on both sides.

**I**F any complain of this prolixity, I confess it will not be altogether without cause. For altho the Controversie of the Eucharist is one of the most important, that is between the Church of Rome and the Protestants, and which deserves therefore to be carefully examin'd, yet since it may be treated, with greater brevity, even this consideration of its importance, is a good reason for shunning all tedious Digressions, which tire the Readers mind, and divert it from attending to so necessary a truth. But it would be very unreasonable to charge me with this irksome length of our Debates, since none can be justly blamed, but those who have first made this Labyrinth, and then plunged themselves into it, to the end they might forcibly draw others after them. For as to my own part, I have ever protested, that I entred not into it, but in condescension only to follow them; and that I might endeavour to draw them out of it, and bring 'em into the right way.

## The Preface.

IT is certain that for ending of this Controversie, we must have recourse only to the Holy Scriptures; by which we may examin the nature of the Sacrament, which our Saviour instituted, and the end which he hath appointed it for, the force of the Expressions which he hath made use of, the manner after which he himself did Celebrate it, the circumstances which accompanied this Celebration, the Impression which his Words and his Actions may be thought to make on the minds of his Apostles, who were eye-witnesses of what they have delivered to us, and the agreement which this Sacrament ought to have with the other parts of the Christian Religion; and in a word every thing which is wont to be consider'd, when men make an exact search after truth. This way without doubt would be the shortest and certainest, or to speak better, the only certain method for satisfaction, and that which can only quiet the Conscience: For the Sacraments of the Christian Religion, being as they are, of an immediate Divine Institution, our Faith, our Hope, and our observance of them, ought to be grounded immediately on the Word of God, there being no Creature who is able to extend them beyond the bounds of the Heavenly Revelation.

IT were indeed to be desired, that the Author of the Perpetuity and Mr. Arnaud had taken this course; but seeing they have been pleased to take another, and enquire after the Faith of the Ancient Church, before the rise of these Controversies, they ought at least to have spared their Readers the trouble of all fruitless and unprofitable Digressions: for so I call whatsoever they have done hitherto; especially in Mr. Arnaud's last Volume. He hath engaged himself to give us another, wherein he promiseth to enquire into the belief of the six first Ages, which plainly shews, that he himself confesses the necessity of such a Disquisition. Wherefore then hath he not at first taken this course, seeing that at length he must come to it? What necessity is there of taking up imaginary suppositions concerning the distinct belief of the Presence, or rather Real Absence; and of the conformity of the Greeks and other Eastern Christians with the Roman Church, in the Doctrine of Transubstantiation?

WE have seen within a short time three different methods of handling this Subject, that of Father Maimbourg's, that of Father Nouet's, and that of Mr. Arnaud. The first seems to put a stop to all farther enquiry, by this reason, that what hath been once established, ought not to be called in question; and on this Principle he justifies the Doctrine of the Real Presence and Transubstantiation, which having been decided by Councils, ought not again to be brought under examination. The second consents to a Review, and to this end allows us to search for the true

Doctrine



## The Preface.

Doctrin of the Church in the Scriptures, and amongst the Fathers from Age to Age. The last permits what hath been already decided to be called in question, but withal, proposeth for finding out the true Doctrin of the Church, that men ought also to hearken to such arguments as are grounded on certain maxims which it supposeth.

O F these three methods, that of Father Nouets is certainly the most reasonable and easie; and had he contented himself with the holy Scripture, without entangling himself in the Writings of the Fathers; which he himself hath compared to a Wood, where such as are pursued do save themselves: on this account his method had been commendable. That of Father Maimbourg is unjust, because he sets up the decisions of Councils against us, not remembring that nothing can be prescribed against Truth; especially when Salvation is concerned; and that the determinations of Councils are not considerable any farther with us, than they are agreeable with the holy Scripture, and the Principles of Christian Religion; there cannot therefore be any more reasonable or effectual way to end these particular Differences which divide us, than to examin strictly and impartially whether this agreeableness which we plead for, be necessary or no. Yet it must be granted, that this method of Father Maimbourg's is far more direct, and better contriv'd than that of Mr. Arnaud's. For besides, that it is more agreeable to the Doctrin and interest of the Roman Church; taking for its Principles the Authority of the Ecclesiastical decisions, which the other doth not, it engageth not a man as the other doth into new Disputes and new dangers: yet both of them avoid a thorough search into the bottom of the Controversie. Now that which opposeth the judgment of the Councils can only involve us in that Debate which concerns the Authority of the Representative Church and its Assemblies; whereas the other makes suppositions which we affirm to be false, and of which we pretend, there cannot any good use be made, even tho we were not able to shew the falsity of them; and by this means it entangles us into new and long Controversies, whereby they gain nothing, but rather run a greater risque of losing the whole Cause which they defend, so that it seems this new way was invented for no other end but to give us new advantages against the Church of Rome and its Doctrins.

AND this will evidently appear, if we take but the pains to read this work. For first we shall see in general the uselesness of the suppositions and reasonings of the Author of the Perpetuity and of Mr. Arnaud, and in particular the unprofitableness of their suppositions touching the Greeks and other Churches, which are called Schismatics. This is the Subject of the first and second Book. In the first I shew that the method of these Gentlemen can be of no effect in respect of us, and that

we

## The Preface.

we are not in reason oblig'd to hear, or answer them, whilst they lay aside the holy Scripture, which is the only Rule of our Faith; and yet leave unanswer'd the proofs of fact, taken from the testimony of the Fathers; by which we are persuaded that there hath been made a change in the Roman Church. In the second I make it appear that tho it were granted that the Greeks and other Christians of the East do agree with the Roman Church in the Doctrins of the Real Presence and Transubstantiation, yet the consequences which these Gentlemen would draw thence will be of no force, for it will not hence follow that these Doctrins have been always received by the Christian Church, which is the chief design of Mr. Arnaud's Book.

IN the second place I discover the falsity of this supposition, that the true Greek Church, and other Eastern Christians do believe Transubstantiation, and Adore the Sacrament after the same manner as the Church of Rome does. The contrary of this will appear so plainly, and Mr. Arnaud's Proofs so solidly answered, that a man would wonder to see with what confidence he treats of this matter, in which he betrays so great ignorance and oversight. Here also his pretended proofs touching the Greeks, from the 7th. to the 11th. and touching the Latins in the 7th. and 8th. Centuries are fully confuted, together with the consequences which he hath blindly drawn from thence of the consent of all Christian Churches in the Doctrins of the Real Presence and Transubstantiation. This is the Subject of the 3d. 4th. and 5th. Book. The third proves by many and clear arguments, that the Greeks do not believe Transubstantiation, nor adore the Sacrament with the adoration of Latria, as the Church of Rome doth, and moreover shews particularly what their Doctrins are, wherein they agree with the Latins and with us, and wherein they differ. In the fourth I answer all Mr. Arnaud's Proofs, discovering their weakness, and make it appear, that the greatest part of what he offers does necessarily conclude against him. And because of the affinity of the matter, I examin at the same time his 7th. Book, wherein he treats of Greek Authors, of the 7th. 8th. 9th. and 10th. Centuries. In my fifth Book I pass over to the other Christians, which are called Schismatics, Moscovites, Armenians, Nestorians, Jacobites, Coptics, Ethiopians, and show they do not believe Transubstantiation nor the Real Presence, with the Latins. From thence I come to the Latins in the 7th. and 8th. Centuries, and examine Mr. Arnaud's 8th. Book, after which I consider his 10th. Book, which concerns the consequences drawn from the consent of the Churches, which he pretends to have proved; and I make it appear that they are but Paralogisms and Sophisms.

## The Preface.

IN the third place I lay open the falsity of Mr. Arnaud's second supposition, touching the distinct belief of the Real Presence, and refute his sixth Book. Afterwards in refuting the ninth Book, I show the absurdity of his conjectures about the impossibility of a change, and demonstrate that 'tis not only possible, but might easily happen. Lastly, the innovation of Paschasius is as evidently prov'd as a thing of that nature can be. This is the subject of my sixth Book.

NOW from all these discourses it will evidently appear what I have already observ'd, That this new way hath not been laid open, but for to give us new advantages against the Church of Rome.

I speak not of the intention of these Gentlemen, for they have declared themselves plainly enough against us, to leave no place for us to suspect them of any collusion. And the last Book of Mr. Arnaud hath provided against all such suspicions something more perhaps than is reasonable. But I speak of the success their method hath had, which hath been quite contrary to their intention. As for example, it hath given me occasion to prove, that the Greeks did not believe Transubstantiation, nor the Real Presence, which the Church of Rome taught, when they condemned Berengarius, neither in the preceding nor following Ages: That whatsoever efforts the Latins have made since the 11th. Age to this present, to procure the reception of these Doctrins in Greece, yet the true Greek Church hath not embraced them: Neither do the Armenians and other Schismatics believe them any more than the Greeks.

NOW who seeth not that the first and most natural consequences which can be drawn from thence is, That these Doctrins are new; for if they were establish'd at first together with the Christian Religion, they would have appeared in those Churches, and been retain'd among them after their separation from the Latins, and that they do not appear, is a manifest sign of their novelty. This consequence is not like that of Mr. Arnaud, his and mine are not only contrary in the matter, but they are likewise very different in form; for mine is just and direct, whereas his is neither just nor true. For suppose the Greeks and other Eastern Christians should at this day believe Transubstantiation, nay suppose they should have believed it, some Ages since, what advantage can Mr. Arnaud make of this, seeing he hath been shewed several ways by which it might be introduced into their Churches? But if it be true that they held it not neither in the 11th, nor in the following Age, as I have invincibly prov'd, then it cannot be imagin'd how it should dis-  
appear,



## The Preface.

appear, nor how the Latins who have for several Ages since, overspread these Countreys with their Emissaries, would have suffered such a Doctrine to be lost amongst them, which it was so much their interest to preserve. Moreover, this same method hath furnish'd me with an occasion to overthrow the pretended impossibilities of a change; and to make appear on the contrary the facility thereof. Now suppose we could not answer the Arguments of the Author of the Perpetuity and Mr. Arnaud, this would be but little advantage to their cause: for still our proofs of the matter of fact, would remain unanswer'd, without the examination of which, the question of the Perpetuity of the Doctrins in Controversie cannot be decided. Whereas these having made it appear that their pretended impossibilities are mere Chimera's, and that this change might easily happen, this is a great inducement to believe our account of it is really true.

IT is then certain that these Gentlemen could not make a worse choice for the interest of the Church of Rome than of such a way, in which nothing of advantage to their Church can be expected, but she is thereby expos'd to great fears and dangers; and that the cause which they have oppos'd is more beholding to them, than that which they have taken upon them to defend. Had it not been for them, perhaps we should not have much troubled our selves either with discovering the real belief of the Greek Church, or that of the Armenians, or with the displaying the mystery of their Seminaries and Missions, neither should we have concern'd our selves in shewing how the change could be wrought, and how it was made.

AND having now given an account of the several parts of this work, and of the present state of this Controversie as to the matter of it, it is likewise fit to say something of the manner in which I have handled it. One of my greatest cares hath been religiously to keep to truth and sincerity. For I am very sensible, that prejudice, partiality, love of vain-glory, and even sometimes a secret desire of revenging a man's self on his Adversary, are passions which do commonly obtrude themselves on us in Disputes, and which never fail to corrupt the mind; I have therefore endeavour'd to the utmost, not only to keep these from me, but likewise to watch against their surprizes. And for this purpose I can affirm I have laboured as in the sight of God, not proposing to my self any other aim than his glory and truth; always remembering that I write not a line of which I must not one day give him an account. I have not warp'd from that sincerity and uprightness which an honest man ought to observe on these occasions. I have not taken Mr. Arnaud's words in a wrong sense, nor charged him with saying what indeed he saith not, nor  
strained

## The Preface.

strained his expressions beyond their natural signification. No man can reproach me for making false citations, or maiming any passages, by suppressing that which is important; neither have I alledged them abusively and contrary to the intention of their Authors. I hope there is no unfair dealings, either in my Arguments, or Answers, in my Suppositions, or my other Discourses. I have followed Reason and Nature as much as I could, and have not made use of Philosophy, but to strengthen the ordinary notions of common sense, and not to stifle or hinder their effects.

I hope likewise that I shall not be complain'd of as having not observed, either in general towards the Church of Rome, or in particular, towards Mr. Arnaud, all that moderation which might be reasonably expected from me. I have noted the Errors and Sophisms of Mr. Arnaud, which I have found very numerous, in every Subject on which he hath treated, especially concerning the Greek Church. I was not a little troubled to see with what sincerity he alledged several passages, whereof some are not faithfully translated; and others so imperfectly, that he hath suppressed whole Clauses, which would clear up the difficulty, and others which are palpably perverted, contrary to the sense of their Authors. I could not but resent his unhandsome dealing, when he disjoyned from the series of a discourse, several of my words, to make them look of a quite contrary sense than what was intended; or fastned on them strange chimerical senses, that he might have some matter of triumph, or groundlessly slandered some famous men, or endeavoured to decry by violent and odious terms our morals, which cannot but be holy and pure, seeing we have no others, but what are taken from the Law and the Gospel. In fine, when he employs his declamatory stile, to dazzle the eyes of the world, and to mis-represent the truth. I have discovered several of his contradictions, and how much his opinions are influenc'd by his interest; several fallacious suppositions which he would have introduced into this Dispute, and some vain and ill-grounded accusations with which he hath charged me; are clearly laid open; and some faults of his in History and Grammar I have but lightly touched upon. In short, I have set before him what I believe he ought to have said on these occasions; and others of the like kind; and do moreover here protest that I should have wholly spared him in the most part of these matters, had the interest of the cause which I take upon me to defend permitted me so to do. But what I have said to him has been without sharpness and passion, and even with as little complaining as may be against his starch'd Prefaces, and imperious tartness, which appears throughout his whole Book, wherein I every where meet with the rough terms of Enthusiasm, Extravagancy, senseless Propositions, and other such like expressions. I confess that

b

these

## The Preface.

these injurious terms were not at all pleasing to me, and presently I wondered that Mr. Arnaud should use a stile so little becoming his profession: but at length being accusom'd to it, I pass'd over it, and have comforted my self by the motives of Christian patience. There are very deserving persons, even of his own Communion, whom he has handled no better than my self; and after all, it suffices me to know that I have not given just cause for so great animosity and bitterness, as I do believe some have already acknowledg'd, and which I believe Mr. Arnaud himself will acknowledg, when he has read my last Chapter, in which I answer his 11th. Book, which concerns our pretended personal differences.

*AS* to exactness, I believe I have kept as much to it as can be desired, in such an Answer as this. Indeed I have not followed blindfold Mr. Arnaud, when he strayed from his own subject, as he has done in the last Chapters of his first Book; where he treats of Episcopacy, of Praying for the Dead, th' Invocation of Saints, the Worship of Relicks, and the Prohibition of certain Meats.

*FOR* seeing the matter in hand only concerns the Eucharist, it would have been contrary to sense, and a gross abuse to the Readers patience, to engage in these Controversies, on each of which there might be written whole Volumes: not to say farther that I have endeavoured to avoid that prolixity which Mr. Arnaud seems on the contrary to have affected. But according to prudence and discretion, I have omitted nothing considerable in Mr. Arnaud's Book, which relates to our present Controversie unanswer'd, except the two Dissertations of the Criticism on John Scot, and on Bertram, to which there is a distinct Answer preparing. It cannot be said that Mr. Arnaud and his friends have done the like by me, for to speak ingeniously and freely, is there any thing less exact or more careless than their large work, considering it as a Refutation of my answer to the Perpetuity, of which they have scarcely handled the tenth part? They have taken here and there some one of my passages separated from the sequel of my discourse, and the greatest part of them turn'd into another sense, hereupon they have travelled from East to West. And this they call the Perpetuity of the Faith defended, against the Book of the Sieur Claude, Minister of Charenton. But seeing I have followed the second Treatise of the Perpetuity, and even accommodated my self to its method, ought not then the Author in defending it against my Book to follow me a little more closely? And when he was oblig'd to write a second Volume, as to what respects the first six Ages, certainly he ought to have considered the rest with some care. Mr. Arnaud's excuse is vain and frivolous which he alledgeth for the length of this work. For to make it short he needed only to have insisted on mat-

ters



## The Preface.

ters essential, avoiding fruitless digressions and retrenching injurious invectives. It is likewise a vain pretence of his, that in following my fancies, as he is pleased to speak, the connexion of his Principles with their consequences, remain hid and obscured. For what else does he intend by this, but to preserve these colours and appearances which cannot otherwise subsist? Wherefore should he call that method which the Author of the Perpetuity hath himself begun, and which I have but follow'd; wherefore I say should he term this my fancies? Wherefore should he at least suppress several things which I proposed in order to the discovery of the falsity of these pretended Principles and their consequences; and wherefore must this neglect have the Title of the Perpetuity defended? For my part, who do not believe my self bound to follow this example, I have examin'd whatsoever I found of importance in Mr. Arnaud, be it never so difficult. If I have changed his method in some places, it hath been to lay down a better, more short and natural, as when I joyned his 7th. Book, which treateth of Greek Authors from the 7th. Age to the 11th. to the general Dispute touching the Greek Church, to avoid doing twice the same thing: or when I referred his sixth Book touching the distinct belief of the Presence, or Real Absence, to the question of the impossibility of a change, because that in effect this distinct belief was not invented but for this purpose, or when I remitted what he said of Paschasius and the Authors of the 9th. Age, in the second part of his 8th. Book, to the account of the Innovation, because this was its proper place. But even in this I have not at all weakened Mr. Arnaud's proofs, nor the less exactly examin'd his Book.

AS to what further remains, the Authors which I have made use of cannot be suspected by Mr. Arnaud, seeing they are for the most part, either Greeks, or persons of the Roman Communion, or Authors of former Ages, which neither one nor other of 'em have written with any foresight of our debate. I have alledged but very few Protestants, and they such of whose sincerity there is no reason to doubt. Mr. Arnaud and his friends have not done the same, who have cited in this Controversie, Acts and Attestations, sent by the Emisseries, such as the Acts of a Synod of Cyprus, the Profession of Faith of six Priests belonging to the Patriarchate of Antioch, and such like particulars in the 12th. Book, of the Writings of the Greeks, Armenians, or Nestorians latinis'd, as of Manuel Calecas, of John Plusiadene, of Adam Nestorian, and of Hacciadour, an Armenian Patriarch now resident at Rome, the testimonies of the Scholars of the Seminary of Rome, as of Paysius, Ligardius, of Abraham Ecchellensis, and of Leo Allatius, &c. They have likewise frequently made use of him that has lately continued Baronius, named Odoricus Raynaldus a



## The Preface.

*Priest of the Oratory at Rome; but if any would know of what authority this Author is, he may be inform'd by this description: He is a man of little wit, of no judgment, no sincerity, no credit, who takes matters upon trust with an unsufferable boldness, and delivers the most unjustifiable pretensions of the Court of Rome with the same confidence as if they were Articles of Faith, who citeth Authors known to be the most partial and passionate of all others, as Poggins, Blondius, Turrecremata, and such like, as un-reprovable witnesses, and by following whose Testimonies, we shall be obliged to condemn the best of men, even those whom God hath own'd by Miracles, who for want of proofs, makes use of unjust clamours and outrageous declamations, unbecoming an Historian, who ought never to be led by passion. And in short, such a man than whom there was never any less fit, for so important a work, as is an Ecclesiastical History. And this is the true Character of this Author. Who would imagin that persons who believe what I now rehearsed, and who desire the whole world to be of the same judgment with them, should make use of him, in a dispute so important as this, and take from him the greatest part of their Relations. And yet these are the Gentlemen who quote him at present with so great confidence, after they themselves have represented him in the manner I mention'd. It was either Mr. Arnaud, or some of his Friends, who under the name of several Divines have taken the pains to publish their Animadversions on this History after a diligent perusal of it. Whereupon may we not justly apply to them that of S. Austin to Faustus, Who is there that having decried a witness as false and corrupted, will ever again produce his testimony? If we believe him, and believe him not according to your fancy, it is not him whom we believe, but you. And if we must needs believe you, what need is there of your producing other witnesses. We shall see what these Gentlemen will do henceforward, for should they take the same course again as they have taken already in this occasion, should they pretend to quote no other Authors but what are decried, false Greeks, Scholars of the Seminaries, persons won to the interests of Rome, or Profelytes of its Doctrin, and remitted to its Sea, this would be as much as to say that their Authority would have a greater share in this Controversie than Reason, and perhaps they might be let alone to talk to themselves, it being very unreasonable that a man should be continually employed in combating Phantasms, and fighting with Shadows. For to maintain faithfully and solidly the Hypothesis of the Author of the Perpetuity, This was most necessary to be prov'd, That the Real Presence and Transubstantiation were establish'd and commonly held in all Christian Churches, when Berengarius his Disputations were on*

foot

Remarks on  
the 18th.  
Tome of the  
Ecclesiastical  
Annals of  
Rodoricus  
Raynaldus.  
Aug. contr.  
Faust. lib. 32.  
ch. 16.

## The Preface.

foot, for which end a thousand attestations of persons now living would be of no use. These attestations may serve to shew that the care which hath been so long taken, and which is still continued to introduce insensibly the Doctrins of the Roman Church into other Churches, by the ways which I have observed in my second Book, and especially by their Missions and Seminaries hath not been altogether fruitless. But this is the greatest absurdity of all, to conclude from thence that the Doctrins in dispute were every where established in Berengarius's time, or that they were perpetual. There is reason to hope that the world will not suffer it self so easily to be cheated, and what hath here been done will sufficiently manifest the Truth.

WE live not now in the times of ignorance and darkness wherein mens credulity is easily abused. Our Age is an enlightned one, and its notices are clear and penetrant, and we should soon see the downfal of several ancient Errors, were they not supported by the affinity which they have with mens temporal interests. God will break off this alliance when it shall seem good in his sight, but it is our duty to keep firm in his truth and prefer the honor we receive from it, above all the advantages of the earth, and beseech him that he would reconcile those to it by his Grace, who are far from it, that all of us may have but one heart to fear him, and one and the same mouth to glorifie him.

---

A T A

---





# A T A B L E O F C H A P T E R S.

## B O O K I.

Wherein is treated of the Method which the Author of the  
*Perpetuity* has follow'd.

### C H A P. I.

**T**HAT I have reason to take for granted, as I have done, the Proofs  
of Mr. Aubertin, against the Book of the *Perpetuity*, till Mr. Ar-  
naud has shew'd them to be invalid Page i

### C H A P. II.

That the Author of the *Perpetuity's* Method may be justly suspected to be  
deceitful, and that his manner of assaulting Mr. Aubertin's Book is disingen-  
uous 8

### C H A P. III.

The third Observation justifi'd, viz. That the Author of the *Perpetuity*  
has been to blame in pretending to overthrow the proofs contain'd in Mr. Au-  
bertin's Book, by Arguments which can amount to no more than mere conje-  
ctures 15

### C H A P. IV.

My fourth Observation justifi'd, viz. that we need but oppose our Proofs of  
Fact against the Author of the *Perpetuity's* Arguments, to make them inva-  
lid 25

### C H A P. V.

The pretended advantages which Mr. Arnaud attributes to the *Treatise* of  
the *Perpetuity*, examin'd 34

### C H A P. VI.

A farther examination of the pretended Advantages which Mr. Arnaud at-  
tributes to the *Treatise* of the *Perpetuity*. 44

### C H A P. VII.

The six last Chapters of Mr. Arnaud's Book, examin'd 53

B O O K



---

## A T A B L E of the Chapters.

---

### B O O K II.

Wherein is shewn, that when it should be true, that those which are called the Schismatical Churches believed Transubstantiation; yet would it not thence follow, that this Doctrin was always held by these Christians.

#### C H A P. I.

**C**ontaining the chief Heads of this whole Controversie touching the Eastern Churches, and their Opinion from the 11th. Century to this present. Mr. Arnaud's first Artifice laid open 61

#### C H A P. II.

That the temporal state of the Eastern People since the 11th. Century, and the efforts the Latins have made to communicate to them their Religion, do invalidate the proof which is pretended to be drawn from their Belief. Mr. Arnaud's second Illusion detected 73

#### C H A P. III.

That the Greek Emperors, led by politic interests, have themselves favoured the designs of the Latins, in introducing their Doctrins into Greece. Mr. Arnaud's third Artifice discovered 81

#### C H A P. IV.

That the Monks and other Emissaries, with which the Eastern Countreys have been for a long time replenish'd, do invalidate the proof, taken from the Belief of these people. Mr. Arnaud's fourth deceit laid open 89

#### C H A P. V.

That the means the Emissaries have used for the introducing of the Roman Religion amongst the Schismatics; the Seminaries which have been set up for the same design, and the particular instructions given them touching the Doctrin of Transubstantiation, do sufficiently shew that there can no advantage accrue to Mr. Arnaud by their Belief. Mr. Arnaud's fifth Artifice discovered 97

---

### B O O K III.

Wherein is shewn that the Greek Schismatical Church, so called, holds not Transubstantiation.

#### C H A P. I.

**T**HE question stated, and Mr. Arnaud's sixth illusion manifested 109

#### C H A P. II.

The first Proof taken from the Greeks refusing to use the term of Transubstantiation: The second from their not expressly teaching the conversion of Substances. Mr. Arnaud's seventh Delusion 114

CHAP.

---

## A TABLE of the Chapters.

---

### CHAP. III.

*The third proof taken from that the expressions used by the Greeks are general, and insufficient to form the idea of a substantial Conversion. The fourth, that the Greeks only receive for determinations of Faith, the Decrees of the seven first General Councils. The remaining part of Mr. Arnaud's Delusion laid open. The fifth proof taken from that the Greeks in their transactions with the Latins have ever kept to their general expressions: Mr. Arnaud's eighth Delusion discovered*

119

### CHAP. IV.

*The sixth proof taken from the Greeks employing on other subjects, the same expressions as on the Eucharist. Mr. Arnaud's tenth Illusion manifested*

129

### CHAP. V.

*The seventh proof drawn from that the Greeks do not believe the Particles of the Virgin Mary and the Saints ought to be Consecrated on the great Altar, as is that of our Saviour, and yet they distribute them to the people, in the same manner as they do the Body of Jesus Christ. Mr. Arnaud's tenth Fallacy laid open. The eighth proof drawn from their believing that the Eucharist Consecrated on Holy Thursday, has a greater virtue than that which is Consecrated at other times. The ninth proof taken out of several passages of their Liturgies*

134

### CHAP. VI.

*The tenth proof taken from that the Greeks do often use an extenuating term, when they call the Eucharist the Body of Jesus Christ. The eleventh from their not believing the wicked who partake of the Eucharist, do receive the Body of Jesus Christ. The twelfth from their believing the Dead, and those in Deserts remote from all Commerce, do receive the same as we do in the Communion*

143

### CHAP. VII.

*That the Greeks adore not the Sacrament with an adoration of Latria, as the Latins do, and consequently believe not Transubstantiation. The thirteenth proof. Mr. Arnaud's eleventh Illusion*

152

### CHAP. VIII.

*The fourteenth proof taken from that the Greeks when ever they argue touching the Azyme, do carry on their Disputes upon this Principle, that the Sacrament is still real Bread after its Consecration. The fifteenth from the little care they take to preserve the substance of the Sacrament. The sixteenth, from a passage of Occumenius*

169

### CHAP. IX.

*The seventeenth proof taken from the Dispute agitated amongst the Greeks in the 12th. Century touching the Eucharist, some of 'em affirming the Body of Jesus Christ to be incorruptible, and others corruptible. The eighteenth from a passage out of Zonarus a Greek Monk that lived in the 12th. Century*

175

### CHAP. X.

*The nineteenth proof, that, we do not find the Greeks do teach the Doctrins which necessarily follow that of Transubstantiation. The twentieth is, the testimony*

c

---

## A TABLE of the Chapters.

---

*Testimony of sundry modern Greeks that have written several Treatises touching their Religion. The one and twentieth, from the form of Abjuration which the Greeks are forced to make when they embrace the Religion of the Latins* 183

### CHAP. XI.

*The two and twentieth proof, taken from an Answer in Manuscript of Metrophanus Critopulus, to some questions offer'd him by Mr. Oosterwieck. The three and twentieth is, another Answer in Manuscript of Meletius Archbishop of Ephesus, and Hieroteus Abbot of the Monastery of Cephalenia. The four and twentieth, is, the testimony of Jeremias a Doctor of the Greek Church. The five and twentieth, is, the testimony of Zacharias Gerganus* 197

### CHAP. XII.

*The twenty sixth proof, taken from the Confession of Faith of Cyrillus Lucar, Patriarch of Constantinople, and what followed thereupon* 201

### CHAP. XIII.

*The real Belief of the Greeks touching the Eucharist* 215

---

## BOOK IV.

*Mr. Arnaud's Proofs touching the Belief of the Greek Church, refuted.*

### CHAP. I.

**M***R. Arnaud's first proof, taken from Cerularius his silence, Examined. The rest of his illusions discovered* 241

### CHAP. II.

*Mr. Arnaud's second proof, taken from Cardinal Humbert's Dispute with Nicetas Pectoratus, examined. His third proof from the testimony of Lanfranc, and silence of the Berengarians, examined. The rest of Mr. Arnaud's Illusions considered* 251

### CHAP. III.

*Mr. Arnaud's twenty first Illusion, is his charging me with maintaining that the Latins never knew Transubstantiation. His two and twentieth consists in offering the formulary of the re-union propos'd to the Greeks by the Latins. The three and twentieth in that he produces the passages of Latinis'd Greeks. The four and twentieth in alledging supposed Authors, or at least doubtful and suspected ones. The five and twentieth is his producing the testimony of several false Greeks, link'd to the interest of the Latin Church* 258

### CHAP. IV.

*The testimony of some Protestants, alledged by Mr. Arnaud, touching the Belief of the Greeks, answered* 269

CHAP.



---

## A TABLE of the Chapters.

---

### CHAP. V.

*Mr. Arnaud's negative Arguments, drawn from the silence of the Greeks and Latins, on the Article of Transubstantiation, examin'd* 272

### CHAP. VI.

*A farther examination of Mr. Arnaud's negative Arguments. A particular reflection on what pass in the Treaties of Reunion, and especially in the Council of Florence and afterwards* 293

### CHAP. VII.

*Several passages of Greek Authors (cited by Mr. Arnaud) examin'd* 306

### CHAP. VIII.

*The Profession of Faith which the Saracens were caused to make in the 12th. Century, considered. Several passages out of Cabañilas, Simeon Archbishop of Theffalonica, Jeremias the Patriarch of Constantinople, and several others, collected by Mr. Arnaud, out of Greek Authors, examin'd* 319

### CHAP. IX.

*Several passages of Anastasius Sinaite, Germane the Patriarch of Constantinople, and Damascen, examin'd* 429

### CHAP. X.

*An examination of the advantages which Mr. Arnaud draws from the two Councils held in Greece in the 8th. Century, upon the subject of Images; the one at Constantinople, the other at Nice* 339

### CHAP. XI.

*Several circumstances relating to the second Council of Nice, examin'd* 355

---

## The Second Part.

---

### BOOK V.

Wherein is treated of the Belief of the *Moscovites*, *Armenians*, *Nestorians*, *Jacobites*, and other Churches, called *Schismatics*; of the Belief of the *Latins* in the 7th. and 8th. Centuries; and of the Consequences which Mr. *Arnaud* draws from the pretended consent of these Churches on the Doctrins of the Real Presence and Transubstantiation.

### CHAP. I.

Of the *MOSCOVITES*.

**T**hat the *Moscovites* do not believe Transubstantiation

Page 1

---

# A TABLE of the Chapters.

---

## CHAP. II.

### Of the ARMENIANS.

*That the Armenians do not believe Transubstantiation: First proof taken from that the Armenians believe the Human Nature of our Saviour Christ was swallow'd up by the Divinity* 14

## CHAP. III.

*The testimony of some Authors who expressly say, or suppose, that the Armenians hold not Transubstantiation* 26

## CHAP. IV.

*Testimonies of several other Authors that affirm the Armenians deny Transubstantiation, and the Real Presence* 38

## CHAP. V.

*Mr. Arnaud's proofs touching the Armenians, examin'd* 44

## CHAP. VI.

*Of the Nestorians, Maronites, Jacobites, Coptics, and Ethiopians, that they hold not Transubstantiation* 50

## CHAP. VII.

*Mr. Arnaud's eighth Book touching the sentiment of the Latins on the mystery of the Eucharist since the year 700, till Paschasius his time, examin'd* 61

## CHAP. VIII.

*An examination of these expressions of the Fathers, That the Eucharist is the Body of Jesus Christ, the proper Body of Jesus Christ, properly the Body of Jesus Christ, the very Body of Jesus Christ, the true Body, or truly the Body of Jesus Christ* 71

## CHAP. IX.

*That the Fathers of the 7th. and 8th. Centuries held not Transubstantiation, nor the Substantial Presence* 89

## CHAP. X.

*An Examination of the Consequences which Mr. Arnaud draws from the pretended consent of all the Christian Churches in the Doctrine of Transubstantiation, and the Real Presence* 98

## CHAP. XI.

*Other Reflections on Mr. Arnaud's consequences* 106

BOOK

---

# A TABLE of the Chapters.

---

## B O O K VI.

Concerning the Change which has hapned in the Doctrin of the Latin Church touching the Eucharist. That this Change was not impossible, and that it has effectually hapned.

### C H A P. I.

**T**HE State of the question touching the distinct knowledg of the Presence, or Real Absence 119

### C H A P. II.

Mr. Arnaud's proceedings considered. His unjust reproaches also examin'd 131

### C H A P. III.

A Defence of the second, third, and fourth rank of persons, against the Objections of Mr. Arnaud 143

### C H A P. IV.

A Defence of the fifth rank against Mr. Arnaud's Objections 154

### C H A P. V.

General Considerations on Mr. Arnaud's ninth Book. An examination of the Objections which he proposes against what he calls *Machins of Abridgment and Machins of Preparation* 163

### C H A P. VI.

Mr. Arnaud's Objections against what he calls the *Machins of Mollification, and the Machins of Execution*, examin'd. The state of the 12th. Century 172

### C H A P. VII.

Mr. Arnaud's Objections against what he terms *Machins of forgetfulness*, examin'd. The examples of the insensible changes alledged, in answer to the Perpetuity, defended 188

### C H A P. VIII.

That Paschasius Ratbert was the first that taught the Real Presence, and conversion of Substances. Mr. Arnaud's Objections answer'd 198

### C H A P. IX.

Proofs that Paschasius was an Innovator 214

### C H A P. X.

Of Authors in the 9th. Century, Walafrius, Strabo, Florus, Remy of Auxerre, Christian Drutmar 229

### C H A P. XI.

Of other Authors in the 9th. Century, Amalarius, Heribald, Raban, Bertram, and John Scot 242

CHAP.



---

## A TABLE of the Chapters.

---

### CHAP. XII.

*Of Personal Differences which Mr. Arnaud has treated of in his 11th. Book*

259

---

An Answer to the *Dissertation* which is at the end of Mr. *Arnaud's* Book, touching the Treatise of our Lords *Body and Blood*; publish'd under the name of *Bertram*, and touching the Authority of *John Scot*, or *Erigenus*.

---

### The first Part.

Wherein is shew'd that the Book of the *Body and Blood* of our Lord, Publish'd under the name of *Bertram*, is a work of *Ratram* a Monk of *Corby*, and not of *John Scot*.

### CHAP. I.

**A**N Account of the several Opinions which the Doctors of the Roman Church have offered touching this Book, to hinder the advantage which we draw from it

277

### CHAP. II.

That what the Author of the *Dissertation* would reform in the Opinion of Mr. De Marca, does not at all make it the more probable

282

### CHAP. III.

That *Ratram* is the Author of the Book of our Lords *Body and Blood*, publish'd under the name of *Bertram*

284

### CHAP. IV.

A Refutation of what the Author of the *Dissertation* offers to persuade that the Book of the *Body and Blood* of our Lord, publish'd under the name of *Bertram* is of *John Scot*

292

### CHAP. V.

Other Difficulties which the Author of the *Dissertation* forms on the name of *Bertram*, examin'd

299

---

## A TABLE of the Chapters.

---

### The Second Part.

That the Authority of the Book of *our Lords Body and Blood*, Publish'd under the name of *Bertram*, will be still of great weight; if we suppose *John Scot* to be the Author of it.

#### CHAP. VI.

**T**hat *John Scot* was greatly esteemed, both in his own age, and in the following ones 303

#### CHAP. VII.

An Examination of what the Author of the Dissertation alledges against the employs of *John Scot* 306

#### CHAP. VIII.

That *John Scot* was esteemed a Martyr 311

The end of the Table:

---

AN

---



1683

*Cenantiibus eis accepit Iesus panem, et benedixit at fregit, deditq; discipulis suis, et ait, accipite et comedite, hoc est &  
 And as they did eat Iesus took the bread, and when he had blessed, he broke it and gave it to the Disciples and said  
 take eat this my body. Mat. 26.*



A N  
ANSWER  
T O  
Mr. Arnaud's Book

INTIT'LED,

The Perpetuity of the Faith of the *Catholick* Church,  
touching the *Eucharist*, defended.

BOOK I.

Wherein is treated of the Method which the Author  
of the *Perpetuity* hath followed.

CHAP. I.

That I have reason to take for granted, as I have done, the Proofs of Mr.  
Aubertin, against the Book of the Perpetuity, till Mr. Arnaud  
bath shewed them to be Invalid.

**A**lthough the Passion, which appeareth throughout Mr. *Ar-*  
*naud's* whole Book, doth in a manner perswade me that his  
Censures are not always reasonable, yet shall not this hinder  
me from examining them with a composed Mind: If they  
are found just, I ought to make my Advantage of them, with-  
out minding the sharpness which accompanies them; and  
if they are not, the Interest of my Cause requires I should endeavour to ma-  
nifest the Injustice of them by a modest and Christian Defence.

AND this Method I intend to use, not only in the beginning but likewise  
in all the following parts of this Work, which I dedicate to the discovery of  
Truth, and the advancement of Gods Glory, who is the Author and Father  
of Lights, and of Truth.

IT is certain, saith Mr. *Arnaud*, in the beginning of his Book, that pro-  
vided Mr. *Claude* may be granted the Priviledge, which he immediately lays  
"hold on, of inventing, and supposing, what he lists, he takes a very sure  
"way to conclude from thence what he pleases. I only admire that while he  
"fancies

"fancies he has this peculiar Liberty, he yet still buſies himſelf in writing Books: For he can abſolutely determine all our Differences with a great deal leſs trouble. For he has no more to do but only immediately to ſuppoſe that the Reaſon is on his ſide, and that the Catholicks are in the wrong, and ſo the whole Controverſie will be at an end, and thus may he ſatiate himſelf with writing half a Page inſtead of an entire Answer, for it decideth the whole; 'Tis but ſuppoſing that Mr. *Aubertin's* Book hath gotten the Victory over the Romiſh Schools, and that he has maniſteſted to all the World, the Change the Roman Church hath made; That the Proofs are clear, ſtrong, and numerous, which make the Change ſenſibly apparent, and that he hath not been oppoſed with any other than falſe and imaginary Reasonings: What need is there then of any other reply, and to what purpoſe does Mr. *Claude* take upon him all this Trouble? *Calvinism* hath now won the Day, and Catholick Religion is utterly Routed.

THE right of oppoſing to the reaſonings of the Author of the *Perpetuity*, the Proofs of the matters of Fact contained in Mr. *Aubertin's* Book, and to ſpeak our Thoughts concerning it, is not ſo marvelous, nor ſuch an extraordinary deſign that Mr. *Arnaud* ſhould need raiſe ſuch a Conteſt about it. This Author having undertaken to make us confeſs, if we are not deſperately obſtinate, that the Belief of the Roman Church, touching the *Eucharift*, is the ſame with that of all Antiquity, and having made uſe of no other reaſonings for this purpoſe, but thoſe which are taken from the moral Impoſſibility of this Change which we believe hath hap'ned; Common Senſe convinces us that he is bound to examine the Proofs of Matters of Fact on which the Opinion, he would root out of our Minds, is eſtabliſhed, for till then all his Arguings will be to no purpoſe. Neither can we juſtly be denied the Liberty of mentioning theſe Proofs according to our real Thoughts. For ſeeing we offer them againſt the Author of the *Perpetuity*, only as a prejudication which hinders us from heark'ning to his Arguments, it is therefore very requiſite we ſhould ſpeak our Thoughts about them, to the end that if this Author continues in the deſign of bringing us to an acknowledgment of what he pretends, he eſpecially take care to remove, as much as in him lies, thoſe things which render all his other Endeavours ineffectual.

I do not at all doubt if mens Minds were free from Prejudice, but it would be granted that Mr. *Aubertin's* Book doth perfectly decide the Controverſie touching the *Eucharift*. It being a complete Piece, in which this matter is ſearched to the bottom. He hath answered thoſe who have treated on this Subject before his time, and yet his Book has layn even to this preſent unanſwer'd, which is a ſufficient Reaſon to preſume he hath gotten the better, and that his Proofs, let Mr. *Arnaud* ſay what he will, are plainly evident and numerous; but for as much as it is needful for the ending of a Difference, and quieting Contradiction, to ſuppoſe Principles granted by both Parties, and ſeeing the Church of *Rome* doth neither agree in the Proofs nor in the Change, here in Queſtion; I do thereupon freely confeſs the Controverſie lyes ſtill open in this reſpect, and that in general we cannot ſtop any mans mouth by the ſimple ſuppoſition of the Strength and Solidity of that Book, for every Man is at liberty, and hath Right (if he pleaſes) to examine and anſwer it.

BUT had not Mr. *Arnaud* ſuppreſſed a great part of what I wrot on this Subject, as well in my firſt as ſecond Answer, it would immediately appear,



I have bin so far from making such a claim as that wherewith he chargeth me, that I have every where expressly maintained the contrary.

*SEEING that Mr. Aubertin has made it appear, by express Passages taken out of the Fathers (these are the Words in my first Answer.) That Transubstantiation was unknown to the antient Church, we may then well conclude there has hap'ned a Change, especially considering that this same Transubstantiation was not heard of till the 11th. Century; Now considering this, for a Man to Philosophize on the impossibility thereof, is to give himself a great deal of Trouble to no purpose. If there yet remain'd any thing farther to be done, it would be to shew that the Passages produced by Mr. Aubertin are either false, or alleaged impertinently against Transubstantiation: but to pass by these matters of Proof, which are clear, express and conclusive, to adhere to I know not what kind of pretended impossibility, this is to trifle with the matter in hand.*

OBSERVE here again what I said in my second Answer. *We had reason to hope that the Author, treating my Abridgment in the respects and relations which the sequel of its Reasons oblige him to, should have applyed himself unto one of these two things.*

*EITHER to make it appear that Mr. Aubertin's Proofs, on which we have relyed; are false, and of no force, or that the Consequence, which is pretended to be drawn from them, is untrue; That is to say, it do's not follow a thing is possible, altho it be made apparent that this very thing has actually hap'ned.*

WHEN a man makes Suppositions of this kind, how absurd is it to say, such a one puts himself in Possession of any *Priviledge*, or usurps that *marvellous Right*, of terminating Differences, or deciding Controversies by groundless Suppositions? For I not only give this Author of the *Perpetuity* the liberty of opposing Mr. *Aubertin's* Proofs, and to shew, if he can, the falsity of them, but I conjure him so to do, being engaged thereunto by the consideration of his own Reputation, and the necessity of this Course to end the Controversie. Now if this may be stiled by Mr. *Arnaud* the deciding of a Difference, I am certain that in the style of a more impartial Judge, this would be called, a disengaging of the Debate out of an endless turning, to bring it back to a necessary Discussion on which dependeth the decision of our Controversie. Mr. *Arnaud* therefore unjustly chargeth me with intending to decide the Question, and terminate the Difference by a simple Supposition, and 'tis through want of Sincerity he has suppressed those Passages in my Answer, which plainly evidence my real Design. But besides these two Defaults which immediately offer themselves to be observed in his Proceedings, I must ingeniously declare that 'tis very hard for me to comprehend what he would have me to do. He seems to desire me to prove that the Proofs of Mr. *Aubertin's* Book are clear, strong and numerous, before we suppose them to be such. But pray what means proving of Proofs? How can a man otherwise prove them than in producing them, and engaging to defend them when they shall be attacked? Now this hath bin done, they have bin produced, in referring to a Book which is easily met with, there has bin an Abridgment made thereof, they have bin set forth with some Enlargments; The Author of the *Perpetuity* hath bin requested to shew the insufficiency or falsity of them. What can Mr. *Arnaud* desire more? Would he have Mr. *Aubertin's* Book reprinted at the Head of mine, together with a Commentary on the Solidity of his Proofs? But yet still



perhaps he would not grant us the Liberty to speak advantageously of it, we must have proved the Solidity of the first Commentary by a second, and that of the second by a third, and so heap up Commentary upon Commentary till Dooms-Day. For he that would have us prove the Proofs of Mr. *Anbertin's* Book may, by the same reason, require us likewise to prove the solidity of our Commentaries, and having set no bounds to his Demands, 'tis probable he would have extended them farther. These are the first Fruits of Mr. *Arnaud's* frolicksome *Philosophy*, the next time when he lights not into so pleasant a Humor, we shall have others, but perhaps not such diverting ones. But be it as it will, there is (I am sure) a great deal of disorder in this proceeding; for the strength of a Proof is with good Reason supposed by that Person who offers it, till it hath received a satisfactory Answer, and so likewise the solidity of an Answer is taken for granted by him who makes it, till such time as it shall be opposed by a good Reply. And certainly such a man would appear Ridiculous, who would offer to put a stop to a Dispute, and exempt himself from replying thereunto, by saying, *prove to me the solidity of your Answer*. If a Proof be not good, it belongs to him who answereth it, to shew its Defects, and if an Answer be impertinent, it lies upon the Opponent to discover the absurdity thereof. For till then every man is at liberty to speak his Thoughts.

ALTHO this is not a proper Place to treat on the different Use which may be made of Suppositions in a Controversie, yet will I not forbear to speak somewhat thereon to discover more plainly Mr. *Arnaud's* Mistakes.

THE Suppositions then commonly made use of, are of two sorts, some of them tend absolutely to decide a Difference, others serve only to regulate it.

WHEN a man makes a Supposition to decide absolutely a Difference, there ought to be supposed no other things but those which are acknowledged and granted to be true by the Adversaries themselves, for these Suppositions are as common and inviolable Prejudications which ought to serve as a Law to direct the Judgment in the whole Controversie.

BUT when we make Suppositions only to regulate the form of a Controversie, and hinder men from casting themselves into fruitless Contests, it sufficeth the things supposed be esteemed true by them who suppose them, others remaining still in the liberty of judging and opposing them, if they think fit. So that after this manner each Party supposeth his Sentiment true, and termeth it his *Hypothesis*, that is to say his Supposition; and if a man supposed it not true, he would not maintain it. We suppose likewise at the same time the Sentiment of the contrary Party false, for if we supposed it not false, we should not reject it. And this is the true state of a Controversie. That every man be permitted to suppose he hath truth on his side, and act, or defend himself on this Supposition, yet allowing others the liberty to suppose the contrary; And this is not that which decideth a Debate, but that which forms it; For by this means there is given to the Controversie its just Bounds, and a man avoids wand'rings, in running after needless things; both parties have a just Equality allotted them, and so far as this, a Person cannot be required to shew his Proof for what he supposeth, provided he fully and unfeignedly declares his Opinion.

IN the following Parts of a Controversie, there ought to be a distinction made between that Person who opposeth a thing, and he who answereth or defendeth it. The first of these designs so to order it that his Adversary shall be obliged to change his Opinion, and therefore he ought not to propose any thing which he makes not good by Proofs; but he has likewise Right (as I said just now) to suppose his Proofs good, till such time as the contrary party has made some Answer. And it would be very absurd to affirm such a one designs to end the Difference by his Suppositions, or is obliged to prove his Proofs are good, seeing he grants every one the Liberty to answer them, and in effect if there appears no Answer, the Difference is decided.

NOW as to him who answereth a matter, having upon this account no other aim but that of rendering ineffectual the Attempt of his Adversary, he has always the Right to suppose his Opinion true without proving it, being only obliged to answer the Proofs which are brought against him, and discover either the falsity or insufficiency of them. A man cannot perhaps fall into a greater irregularity, than to constrain him that Answereth, (and who has no more to do than to refuse the Arguments alledged against him,) to make Arguments himself, and to pretend that he hath no right to propose his Answers taken from the Opinions themselves which he defendeth, if he hath not before this proved his Opinion. Either he who opposeth must make apparent the falsity of the supposed Opinion, or else he must yield it to be true.

I know that in a publick Dispute, mannaged by writing, it commonly happens, that the same Person opposeth another and defendeth himself; propounds and answers, according as the occasion and matter requireth, but we are notwithstanding obliged to distinguish these two Qualities, of *Aggressor* and Respondent, and preserve to each his Right apart; for it would be a very disorderly matter to expect a man should do that when he answereth, which he is not obliged to do but when he opposeth, or to expect he should do that when he opposeth, which he is not obliged to do but in answering. It sometimes happens that an Adversary makes an Exchange, and whereas he is obliged to answer directly to the Proofs of the contrary Party, or to oppose others against him of the like Nature and Force, he shifts them and falls into a Discourse to no purpose, and all this while the contrary Proofs he should have answered, remain firm. In such an occasion we have Power to reduce such a one from his affected Wand'rings, by supposing the Proofs he has left unanswered, strong and solid. For in such a case they are not supposed good and firm, but only to oblige him to answer them, and shew their weakness or falsity, and if he answereth them not, we may reckon as to him the Question in effect is decided, because when a man hath nothing to say against the Method of proceeding, and that the forementioned Proofs have bin proposed according to the exact Rules of Disputation, a man must then either acquiesce in them or answer them, and to do neither of these is mere wrangling.

NOW to apply these Maxims to the matter in hand, and to judge of Mr. *Arnaud's* Censure, we need but consider first, That when I supposed Mr. *Aubertin's* Proofs to be firm and good, I did not thereby propose to my self an absolute end of the Question touching the Change which hath hapned in the Church of *Rome*, by this simple Supposition; but only to regulate the

the Debate, and reduce it within those Bounds wherein it ought to be. Secondly, that in supposing them good, I have only delivered my Opinion which I take upon me to maintain against the Author of the *Perpetuity*, without depriving him of the Liberty of defending the contrary. Thirdly, that I have supposed them to be good without proving them so, because we ever suppose Proofs sufficiently firm, till such time as something at least is objected against them, and hitherto Mr. *Aubertin's* Book has layn unanswered. Fourthly, that I made use of them as a means whereby to resist the Author of the *Perpetuity's* attempt, and when a man only defends himself in a Dispute, he is not obliged to prove any thing. Fifthly and lastly, I did not offer them but only as Prejudices at his Opinion, which ought necessarily to be removed out of our Minds, before the Arguments of the *Perpetuity* be offered us; for as much as these Prejudices make the Author's Reasonings ineffectual and improper to that design of making us acknowledge there hath bin introduced no Change into the *Roman Church*. From whence it follows, that I may not only suppose these Proofs are clear, firm, and numerous, seeing that 'tis under this Notion we have entertained these Prejudices; but moreover suppose them without proving them, and I do so, to the end I may oblige the Author of that *Treatise* to shew us (if he can) that they do not amount to what we imagine.

IN short if he would obtain his end, he must shew us that our Prejudice ought not to hinder us from hearkning to what he hath farther to offer us, (which is to say,) supposing our Proofs to be most firm and evident, yet ought they not to avert our Minds from considering his moral Conjectures;) or shew us that our Prejudices have no grounds, and that our Proofs are neither plain nor sufficient. The first of these is absurd, the second is what we desire him to take in hand. But instead of this Mr. *Arnaud* has bethought himself, and requires us to prove the validity of our Proofs.

IF our Proofs, being supposed good, are in effect the *Calvinists Victory*, and the *Romanists Defeat*, as Mr. *Arnaud* himself granteth, we have reason to admire he should think he hath overthrown them, by five or six Lines stuffed with *Railery*.

HATH he bin more concerned at the calling of the Reasonings of the *Perpetuity*, imaginary Conjectures, than at the glorious Victory over the *Romish Church* which hath bin attributed to Mr. *Aubertin's* Book, and this Innovation brought in by the Church of *Rome*, which is apparent to all the World? Doth he more value the Reputation he thinks he hath gotten by writing a small *Treatise*, than the settlement of the *Catholick Church*? and ought he, for the interest of a particular work, to have rifled both *East* and *West*, whilst in the meantime the *Catholick Church* perisheth before his eyes, lying prostrate at the Feet of *Victorious Calvinisme*. I will grant my Supposition resides but in my own Imagination, and in theirs of the same Communion, yet certainly this a man would think, should be sufficient to stir up the Zeal, of a Person whom the Son of God hath given to the Church to be a Teacher of Truth, and who hath bin enlightened by his Grace, and filled with his Spirit, on purpose to rescue and vindicate Truth from the Subtilties, and false Glosses of Error, as speaketh one of his Approbationers.

THIS I think should be sufficient to make him prefer the Reputation of his whole Church before that of a single Author, of whose name the greatest

Mr. de Vence  
in his Appro-  
bation.



greatest part of the World is still ignorant. And moreover, as hath bin already said, this Prejudice under which we labour, whether true or false, makes a distinction between the interest of this Treatise, and those of the *Romish* Church, for it puts a stop to all the pretensions of the Author, and bereaves him of all the Conquests he promised himself. For to regain the Author of the *Perpetuity's* Reputation, will be to no purpose, seeing that *Calvinisme* will not give over celebrating *Aubertin's* Victories, and stand firm to his Proofs. The Confutation of *Aubertin's* Book would be to give such a mighty stroak, as would ever stop the Mouth of *Calvinisme*, and at the sametime, raise up the Glory of the Catholick Church out of the Dust. There ought to have bin no waverings between these two Parties, and yet Mr. *Arnaud*, this Doctor who hath bin given to the Church furnished with such Gifts, betakes himself to the writing of a Treatise, and sends the Church away till another time.

IN short, to finish the justification of my yet unproved Supposition, I need but propose the Example of a man who, to shew me the Victories which the Treatise of the *Perpetuity* hath obtained against us, if we have any Reason left us, supposeth without proving it, that the Proofs of this Book are plain and solid. If I should apply to him Mr. *Arnaud's* Maxims, and tell him that provided he may have the Liberty which he immediately makes use of, inventing and supposing what he pleaseth, he is in a sure way to conclude thence what he will, that these kind of discourses founded on unproved Suppositions, are not wholly judicious, and that they shew he knoweth not how to distinguish between the things which he is not permitted to assert till he hath proved them, and those which may be justly supposed without being proved.

IF this man reply to me, he has only made this Supposition to oblige Mr. *Claude* to acknowledge he hath no other means left to defend himself, but by shewing (if he can) the Reasonings of this Treatise are not just; May I not then justly retort upon him, that I only suppose Mr. *Aubertin's* Proofs are plain and firm, that I may thereby force the Author of the *Perpetuity* to confess he hath no other way left him to defend himself, but to shew, if he be able, that these Proofs are invalid? Mr. *Arnaud* perhaps would be so reasonable as not to deny me the liberty of making use of these Principles, and so much the rather because there is a very material and advantageous difference on my side, seeing, as already mentioned, I am Respondent in this Dispute; whereas this Person would be the Aggressor. But you will ask me, who this man is, that is so little acquainted with Mr. *Arnaud's* Maxims? Even Mr. *Arnaud* himself, who having produced a long train of Arguments in the fifth and sixth Chapters of his first Book; to shew us that the *Learned*, and *Unlearned*, the *Simple*, and *Obstinate*, and all Persons in general ought to acquiesce in the Proofs of the *Perpetuity*, he thereupon makes this Conclusion, 'Tis true, saith he, that these Arguments being applyed to the Book of the *Lib. 1. Ch. 6.* *Perpetuity*, suppose the Proofs are clear and solid, and therefore I make use of *pag. 62.* them in this place to remove these vain Exceptions of Mr. *Claude*, who would *pag. 63.* have them rejected without examining them, on this general Reason, That they are Argumentative Proofs. Mr. *Claude* hath no other way of defending himself than by shewing, if he can, the Arguments in this Treatise are not sound. We shall see by what follows, whether he had reason to make this Supposition, I shall content my self at present with concluding according to his Example, that every man may make Suppositions, provided he intends not thereby to end the Debate, but only oblige an Adversary to come to the Discussion of

of that Point which he is not willing to meddle with. And thus doth Mr. *Arnaud* censure in another that which he doth himself.

## CHAP. II.

*That the Author of the Perpetuity's Method may be justly Suspected to be deceitful, and that his manner of assaulting Mr. Aubertin's Book is Disingenuous.*

**T**HE Method the Author of the *Perpetuity* makes use of to make us confess, as he says; *that the Doctrine of the Roman Church, touching the Eucharist, is the same with that of all Antiquity*, hath appeared so strange and irregular to me, that I have made these following Reflexions thereupon.

I. That it may be justly suspected of Artifice and Illusion.

II. That this way of Assaulting Mr. *Aubertin's* Book is Disingenuous and Indirect.

III. That the Author hath bin to blame in pretending to shew the Invalidity of Mr. *Aubertin's* Proofs by Arguments which at most do amount but to mere Conjectures.

IV. That to confute at once all these Arguments, we need but oppose against them these same Proofs of matters of Fact, and by gathering them into an Abridgment, to give a general view of them.

Lib. 1. ch. 1.  
p. 1.

Mr. *Arnaud* confesses that I were not to be blamed for having in my Answer fall'n first upon the Faults which I pretend to discover in the Author of the *Perpetuity's* Method, *provided*, saith he, that *I maintained Equity and Truth*; It may be, I think, then supposed I have so far done nothing contrary to Rule, it only remains I make good the four above-mentioned Reflexions.

The first Observation justified.

I shall not insist long upon the first of these, because Mr. *Arnaud* hath alledged nothing against it, appearing undenyable in it self. It is grounded on this, That when the Question concerns what we ought to believe touching the *Eucharist*, the Author of the *Perpetuity* would have this Question decided, not by the word of God, but the Churches Consent in all Ages, and Depositions of the *Fathers*, and when it comes to the Enquiry after this Consent of the Church, he would have this second Question resolved not by Passages taken out of the Writings of the *Fathers*, but by Arguments. Now this is certainly a most tedious and preposterous Course; it being a Principle of common Sense, that Questions in matters of *Right* ought to be naturally decided by the Rule of *Right*, then when the Rule determining that *Right* is distinct and separated from matters of Fact, and that again naturally the Questions

Questions in matters of Fact ought to be decided by an exact Consideration of the Facts themselves, or by Witnesses who can make a lawful Deposition.

Seeing then the Christian Religion offers us a distinct Rule, and that too as it lies separate from matters of Fact; (which is that holy Scripture, wherein God hath made a full Revelation of his Will;) it is in it we must search for what we ought to believe, and not in the consent of the Church in all Ages. For as the *Fathers* thought they were obliged to ground their Belief on the Scriptures, so likewise we, who have the same Faith with them, ought to ground our Faith on the same Principle. The Scripture hath been given us to determine thereby our Apprehensions of the Mysteries of Religion, but their Belief who preceded us can be no more at farthest, than an Example for us to Imitate, and an Example too submitted to the same Rule, which requires no farther our Approbation than it agrees with that; so that to decide Questions of this Nature by the Examples of former Ages, is to pervert the natural Order and Design of things.

IT will be to no purpose to alledge The Church of *Rome* will not allow the Scriptures to be the only Rule of our Faith, seeing it likewise taketh in Tradition. Yet this Answer will not clear the Author of the *Perpetuity* from that Reproach with which I shall charge him: For when a man lays down a Method in a Controversie, and proposes it as sufficient to convince those who are not of his own Opinion, he must ground this Method on Principles granted by both Parties; for if his Positions are such as may be questioned, he is then obliged to a solid Proof of them, before he can suppose them. For if he take not this Course, he will quickly be at a loss, and his whole Work soon rendered ineffectual. Now this the Author of the *Perpetuity* has not done, for he has not proved that the Consent of all Ages ought to be our Rule in matters of Faith. 'Tis true he has told us of the ill Consequences which would follow the condemning the *Antient Fathers*, and that we should do, if we suppose them guilty of an Idolatrous Worship. But this reaches not our Question: for it doth not hence follow that their Writings are the Rule of our Faith, neither in the matter of our present Debate, nor in any other: For the *Fathers* may be free from damnable Errors in any Article of our Religion, by the agreement their Doctrine hath with that Rule which enjoyneth us to believe, without becoming a Rule themselves and without arrogating this supreme Authority over mens Consciences, which ought to decide all Questions of this Nature.

But perhaps it will be replied that, provided we attain the knowledge of the Truth in what we ought to believe concerning so important a Subject as that of the *Eucharist*, what need we matter, by what means we obtain it, whether by means of the holy Scripture, or by Consent of the antient Church? If we follow not the *Fathers* as the Rule of our Faith, let us follow them then as an Example held out for us to imitate. To which I answer, That the cause which I have taken upon me to defend would in the main lose nothing, though we should take the Belief of the Antient Church in this matter for the Model and Rule of ours, so that this doth not at all trouble us.

BUT be it as it will, we must not forsake the Word of God, nor wholly build our Faith on any other Principles but those which are drawn from the Holy Scriptures. Our Faith would not then be what it ought to be, that is



to say, A Divine Faith, were it but an imitation of the Belief of the *Fathers*. This Maxim of regulating our Religion by an Imitation of them who have preceded us, without having any fixed Principle, is certainly of very dangerous Consequence. For 'twould happen at length after some Ages, that the last would have no resemblance with the former, because that humane Imperfections which commonly mix themselves in such an Imitation, would never be wanting to disorder and corrupt it, as is commonly seen in the drawing of a Picture, Draughts of which being taken one from the other, become still every time less Perfect, as they are farthest distant from their Original.

THE Author then of the *Perpetuity* cannot be excused for his perverting the order of the Dispute with which I charge him, that he would decide this Question of Right by matters of Fact; Neither is he less inexcusable when he would have the Question of matter of Fact, to depend on the force of his Reasoning. The matter before us is to know what has bin the Opinion of the *Fathers* touching the *Eucharist*, and he pretends to decide this Question not by the Testimony of the *Fathers* themselves, but by certain Impossibilities he imagines in the change which we suppose. I know very well that there are sometimes Enquiries made into matters of Fact, the Truth of which cannot be attested by any Witness, and I confess in this case, no man can be blamed for having recourse to Reasonings, because there being no other Evidence to help us in our Search, even Necessity warranteth this way of Proceeding, altho it be indirect. But we are not in these Circumstances, seeing we have the Writings of the Antients, and those no less considerable for their Number than for the many clear Passages they contain touching the *Eucharist*; which if we will apply our selves unto, we shall soon discover their Opinions about it. What need is there then, for us to leave our enquiries into the Opinion of the *Fathers*, to hearken to the Author of the *Perpetuity's* Arguments? May we not now justly complain of him, and answer him, this is the way of Inquiry which Nature it self hath prescribed us, and comparing these two ways, the more natural appeareth to us to be the more direct and certain. From whence it immediately follows, That his manner of proceeding, may well be suspected as artificial and deceitful, for it is usual with us to suspect that Person who leaves the common Road, to walk in by-Paths.

The second  
Observation  
justified, Lib.  
Chap. 1. P. 4.

MY second Observation on the Author of the *Perpetuity's* Method, respects the manner of his Assaulting Mr. *Aubertin's* Book. And seeing Mr. *Arnaud* hath charged me with falsity, for affirming Mr. *Aubertin's* Book hath chiefly occasioned this Controversie, and that the Author of the *Perpetuity* hath set upon it after an indirect manner. I am thereupon obliged to divide the Subject of my justification under two Heads. I shall first then make it appear that Mr. *Aubertin's* Book hath bin assaulted, and hath bin the first occasion of this Debate. Secondly, that his Book has bin Assaulted after an unjust manner.

THE first of these Particulars shall be dispatched in two Words, for on one hand I have no more to do, but only desire the Reader himself to peruse the second Section of the first Treatise of the *Perpetuity*, where he shall find that in fifty one Pages which it contains, his whole design is only to refute Mr. *Aubertin's* Account of the *Innovation* which hath hap'ned touching Transubstantiation: And on the other, I have no more to do but declare to the

the World, That from the first Moment of our Debate, which was precisely then when I began to answer this Treatise, I propos'd to my self not only particularly to maintain the Truth of this Account, but defend in general the whole Book; against the indirect attempts of that *Treatise*. Now if this may not be call'd the first occasion of this Contest, I know not any longer how to name things. For what is there which maketh a Book the first occasion of a Debate, which is not here? Must a Book be assaulted? this hath bin so. Must it be defended? this hath bin so. Ought he who takes upon him the Defence of it, to do it with a design of keeping up its Credit? This hath bin likewise my Design, because its Interests have appeared to me to be the same with those of the Truth. Where then is this *notorious Falsity* with which Mr. *Arnaud* chargeth me?

*THE Author of the Perpetuity*, saith he, never pretended his *Treatise* was a refutation of that *Ministers Book*, and in a matter as this is, which dependeth on the Intention of a man yet living, it were sufficient to convince Mr. Claude of rashness to tell him, as from him, he is mistaken, and that this Author never designed what he charges him with. Moreover he adds, That this *Treatise* was primarily intended only as a Preface to the Office of the blessed Sacrament: and that we seldom find any man undertake to refute a Book in Folio, in a Preface: That he handleth the Question of the Impossibility of an Innovation: That he refuteth Blondel and Aubertin by the way, who had impos'd fabulous Relations on the World: And that he directly indeed argueth against Mr. Aubertin's pretended Innovation, but medleth farther with no other part of his Book.

Lib. 1 Chap. 1.  
Pag. 4.

Mr. *Arnaud* I hope will pardon me, if I affirm that there's not one word of Truth in all this. For, to speak properly, the occasion of this Contest can be no other but that taken from the Obligation I had to enter into this Dispute, seeing our Debate began but from that time I interpos'd. For had I not stept in between, the Author had talk'd only to himself, and when a man does so, we are not wont to say, such a one is in a Dispute. To find then the real Occasion, Mr. *Arnaud* should have sought it in the causes moving me to interpose, and not in the *Author of the Perpetuity's* Intention. Mr. *Arnaud* hath not consider'd there is a Difference between the Occasion of a Debate, and whether the Subject of it be real or imaginary. For to decide the latter of these Particulars, we must look back to the Author of the *Perpetuity*, and consider what he has done, and what he would do, but to be ascertain'd in the first of them, I ought thereupon to be consult'd: and when it shall appear I was deceived by a groundless Imagination that Mr. *Aubertin's* Book hath bin assaulted, then it might be truly affirm'd I rais'd a Quarrel to no purpose, seeing the occasion of it only sprang out of my own Fancy; but yet what I have said since cannot be charged with *notorious Falsity*, viz. That this Book was the first occasion of the Debate betwixt us, seeing that in effect I only engag'd in this Controversie to defend it.

THERE is moreover in Mr. *Arnaud's* Discourse a false Supposition in the Term of *Refuting*, for he supposeth I charge the Author of the *Perpetuity* with a design of formally and directly refuting Mr. *Aubertin's* whole Book, and 'tis thereupon he tells us, that seldom any man undertakes to refute a large Folio in a Preface. But he does not consider, that I did not for this reason use the Term of *Refuting*, but *Assaulting*, and that far from charging the Author of the *Perpetuity* with this Design of a Refutation, my complaint hath bin on the contrary, that he has not refuted this Book, and which

hath been grounded on the Necessity urging him to have done it, as I shall shew hereafter. Now to justify what I said, that Mr. *Aubertin's* Book hath been the first Occasion of this Debate, and at the same time, that this is not an ill-grounded Supposition, I need not repeat that the Author of the Treatise designed to refute that whole Book, it appears to me sufficient he hath assaulted the last part of it, and undertaken to answer it throughout the second Section of his Treatise. It sufficeth me that his first Section tendeth to render incredible Mr. *Aubertin's* account of an Innovation. It sufficeth me, the drift of his whole Work is to make Mr. *Aubertin's* Proofs of matters of Fact altogether useless to us. And this is more than need to be said to refute this fierce Accusation of *notorious Falsity*, with which Charge Mr. *Arnaud* hath begun his Book. Now this is apparently true, and a man needs but his Eyes and common Sense to be satisfied in it.

Mr. *Arnaud* may tell us what he pleases concerning the Author of the *Perpetuity's* real Design. Yet shall I answer him, that when men judge of a Work, their Judgment is guided by what appears in the Work it self, and not by the secret Intentions of its Author. For mens Designs many times lye hid, but the drift of their Work lies open. I do not pretend to penetrate into mens Hearts, yet cannot I be withheld from judging of the Treatise of the *Perpetuity*, because 'tis before my Eyes.

THAT this Treatise was at first, but a simple Preface, or that it was not, it avails me little to know, for I am not usually so much in Love with Rarities, as to extend my Curiosity into the Author of the *Perpetuity's* disavowed Designs. If this Work hath been heretofore but a Preface, and that it hath been since raised to the dignity of a Treatise, there hath been reason perhaps for its ennobling, its Desert hath made it worthy of this Honour; and they are at this day to blame who have reproached it with the meanness of its former Condition, in an occasion, which called for the establishment of its Glory. But be it what it will, *Preface*, or *Treatise*, it is all one to me, it assaulteth never the less for this Mr. *Aubertin's* Book.

BUT saith Mr. *Arnaud*, he refutes it by the way. By the way, of four score and eight Pages which it contains, there are one and fifty of them employed in a formal Refutation of Mr. *Aubertin's* account of an Innovation, and the drift of the rest, as I have already said, is to shew that this Account is incredible, because 'tis impossible, and indirectly to overthrow the whole Work. So that here I think the charge of our first *notorious Falsity*, appears to be untrue. Let us see the second, which is that I affirmed, *The Author of the Perpetuity hath assaulted Mr. Aubertin's Book after an indirect manner*. But to apprehend thoroughly the truth of this Observation, Mr. *Aubertin's* whole Book must be granted to be a Discourse only touching the *Eucharist*, and which is divided into three Parts. In the first he handleth this Subject by Arguments drawn from Scripture, and humane Reason. He produceth the Passages thereof, and Arguments fetched from thence, and refutes the Answers made thereunto, nay he near upon answereth whatsoever Controversists have stated hitherto considerable on this Subject. In the second, he examines the Churches Belief, during six Centuries, by an exact Discussion of all Passages produced on either side, makes it plainly appear that *Transubstantiation*, and the real *Presence* are Doctrines which have bin unknown during all that time. And in the third, he gives an account after what manner their Doctrines have been introduced.

THE



THE first part treateth of the Question of Right, shewing the true Rules of it, and serves as a Foundation to the second. The second Part handleth the Question of matter of Fact, by a faithful deposition of Witnesses, that is to say, by the Fathers from Age to Age, and serves as a Foundation to the third. And the third Part shews the Degrees of this Innovation, the Time when it begun, its Authors, and the Opposition which it hath met with.

THIS being so, I say, it is an indirect Proceeding, to single out this last Part from the second, and attempt the refuting of it alone, as the Author of the *Perpetuity* hath done. And the Reason is manifest, because the only Foundation on which the last Part is built, and which communicateth to it all its force of Perswasion consisteth in its second. For wherefore do we believe, for Example, what it saith concerning the Innovation which *Anastasius Sinaite* hath introduced, in reference to Expressions, he having bin the first that rejected the Terms of *Type* or *Figure* on the Subject of the *Eucharist*? It is because he shews us in his second Part, that the *Fathers* who preceded *Anastasius*, ever made use of this manner of Expression, for we find not any one of them who rejected them. Wherefore do we take *Paschasius* to be the first who ever thought of the real Presence? The Reason, is because we never meet with any before his time, who thus deliver themselves. So that the second Part of Mr. *Aubertin's* Book does necessarily prepare the Reader for the third. In the second Part he sheweth the State of the Church, for the six first Ages, to be quite different from what is seen at present in the Church of *Rome*: The Reader then thereupon finds there has bin an Innovation, and supposes it to be not only possible, but that it hath actually hap'ned, so that it only remains to know, when, by whom, and by what Degrees this Change has bin introduced, and this is sufficiently set forth in the third Part. It cannot therefore be singled out from the second to be opposed alone, without the greatest Injustice and Disingenuity; for this is to strip it of all its Strength, and to deal with it, as the *Philistims* did with *Samson*, cut off his Hair before they set upon him.

Mr. *Aubertin* offered not his Account to the Reader till he had prepared him by a necessary Premonition to receive it; Whereas the Author of the *Perpetuity* would have it considered and examined with an unprepared Mind, or rather, to speak better, with a Mind fill'd with contrary Dispositions. Now this is not fair Dealing. For to proceed orderly, he ought to have begun with these first Preparations; and made it appear (if he could) that they were fallacious, and so discover the injustice, falsity, or weakness of them, and afterwards set upon the Account he gives us. Had he taken this Course, we should have had nothing to charge him with, touching his Method; but to stifle these Preparations, and cut 'em off from the Dispute, and fall immediately upon his Account of the *Innovation*, is that which will ever deserve the name of *indirect Dealing*.

AND if we consider likewise the manner after which the Author of the *Perpetuity* hath endeavoured to overthrow this Account, it will be found his Proceedings are in this Respect as disingenuous as in the former. As for Instance, Mr. *Aubertin* observes that *Anastasius Sinaite* hath bin the first who varied from the common Expressions of the Antients, in saying, The *Eucharist*

Perpetuity of  
the Faith, P.  
30. 51. &c.

*Eucharist* is not an *Antitype* but the Body of *Jesus Christ*. Now to refute directly this Historical Passage, (being agreed as we are in this Particular relating to *Anastasius*) there ought to have bin the like Passages produced of them who preceded him, and to have made it thence appear he was not the first who thus expressed himself. But instead of this, the Author of the *Perpetuity* takes another Course, for he demands, *how this can be*, That *Anastasius*, who could not be ignorant of the Churches Belief in his time, should offer an Opinion which would be formally opposed, and this without acknowledging, he proposed a contrary Opinion? He indeavours to shew this Innovation could not overspread either *East* or *West*, and that *Anastasius's* real meaning, and that of them who spake like him in this particular, could not be the Impannation of the *Word* with which Mr. *Aubertin* seems to charge them. And the same doth he, in respect of *Paschasius*, whom Mr. *Aubertin* Affirms to be the first Author of the *Real Presence*, for instead of shewing others held the same Opinion, and that he did not teach a new Doctrine, he sets himself upon shewing, that if *Paschasius* had bin an *Innovator*, he would have bin taken notice of in some one of the Councils held in his time, that he would have bin opposed, and never offered his Opinion as the received Doctrine of the Church, as he has done. I will not now enquire into the strength of his Arguments, neither will I say they ought to be rejected for this Reason alone, that they are indirect, The Question is here whether this course of refuting Mr. *Aubertin's* Book be warrantable, and it must be granted, it is not; for the chief design of this his Account being only to demonstrate, that *Anastasius*, and *Paschasius* introduced Innovations; Now to make it appear they were not Innovators, there ought to have bin produced several Passages out of the Writings of those who preceded them, which should come near the same Expressions, or at least amounted to the same Sence as that of theirs, which the Author of the *Perpetuity* hath not done.

LET Mr. *Arnaud* consider again then, if he pleases, the Question, and whether I have broached two notorious Untruths, the one, that Mr. *Aubertin's* Book was the first occasion of this Contest, the other, that the Author of the *Perpetuity* hath attacked it after an indirect manner. Now to the end I may have from him a second Sentence more favourable than the former; it will not be amiss to answer his Objections, and shew him first, That I pretend not to hinder any Person from choosing those Points or Matters for which he hath the greatest Inclination: for, provided he handles them in a regular manner, he will thereby oblige the publick. Secondly I do not so much as pretend to hinder any man from refuting part of a Book, and leaving the other, provided this Part may be well refuted alone, and there be no cause to complain that the force of the Arguments is spoiled by such a separation. Thirdly, Neither do I take upon me to call the Author of the *Perpetuity* to account about his employing himself, and require of him two Volumes in Folio. For I am willing to believe his Employes are great and difficult, and therefore afford him not time enough to make a direct and compleat Refutation of Mr. *Aubertin's* Book.

Lib. 1. Ch. 1.  
Pag. 7.

AND as to what he tells us, that we cannot reasonably require more from a Person who handleth any Subject, than that he suppose nothing which is False, or Obscure, and draw not from thence ill Consequences, seeing the truth and clearness of Principles, and the justness of their Consequences are in themselves sufficient, to assure us of the Truth, and gives us a clear and perfect

Notion

notion thereof. To which I answer, This is true, when Persons are agreed to treat on this Subject, and do take this course to decide the principal Question of it, for in this case, only the Principles and their Consequences ought to be examined. But if this be not consented to, but on the contrary there are general Observations made upon the Method, then it is not particularly minded Whether the Principles are disputable or not, nor Whether their Consequences are true or false, for this follows afterwards. The Method of handling the Subject is only considered, without regard to the Principles or Conclusions; That is to say, Whether 'tis direct or disorderly, natural or against Nature, sufficient to persuade, and end the Controversie or not, and on this account, it may be justly expected from a Person that he take a right Method rather than a wrong, one which is a Natural, rather than that which is not so. For such a one may well be told, He spends his time to no purpose, that takes not a right way to obtain the end of what he designs. Now this is exactly what we have to alledge against the Author of the *Perpetuity*, as will appear in the following Chapter. We have reason to wonder that Mr. *Arnaud* should deny us the liberty of making these general Reflexions, he I say, who confessed in the second Period of his first Chapter, that I am not to blame for having grounded my chief Accusations against the Author of the *Perpetuity's* Method, upon the Defects I found therein, provided I establish Truth and Reason. But this doth not well agree with what he saies here. *That there cannot be any thing justly required of a man who treateth on any Subject, but only this, That he lay down good Principles, and draw thence true Conclusions.* For the falsity of Principles, or Consequences, proceeds rather from a defect in the Matter, or Form of an Argument in Particular, than in a Method in General.

## CHAP. III.

*THE third Observation justified, viz. That the Author of the Perpetuity has bin to blame in pretending to overthrow the Proofs contained in Mr. Aubertin's Book, by Arguments which can amount to no more than mere Conjectures.*

**M**R. *Arnaud* seems unwilling to grant, That the Author of the *Perpetuity* has endeavoured to invalidate our Proofs of Matters of Fact contained in Mr. *Aubertin's* Book by his Arguments, and thereupon has only proposed the Question in these Terms: *viz. Whether a man may not argue against matters of Fact: And takes it for granted he may in some particular Cases.* It is then our part to shew, he wanders from the Point, and that the Author of the *Perpetuity* has not only designed to oppose, but even overthrow by his arguings our Proofs of Fact, so that the Question now is whether this Endeavour of his is just or unjust, whether according to a regular Course or contrary to it.

Lib. I. Ch. 2.

AND for this purpose, I shall only desire Mr. *Arnaud* to consider, That the Design of the Method, or advantage expected by it, as it hath bin expressly



pressly declared in the fourteenth Page of the first Treatise, *Is to bring any unprejudiced Person, to acknowledge the Church of Rome's Belief touching the Eucharist to be the same with that of all Antiquity*; and this new Method is proposed to remedy an Inconveniency, usually attending that ordinary Method, called *Discussion*, wherein it frequently happens, *that men seldom sufficiently comprehend the strength of Proofs; because they are not considered in their right order, which ever so placeth them as that they mutually assist and fortifie each other*. I need but entreat him likewise to remember the first Title of the *Treatise*, before it was printed, when it was put into my Hands to be answered; which was as follows, *A Treatise containing an easie Means to convince Hereticks, by shewing them there has no alteration bin made in the Churches Belief touching the Eucharist, as I already observed in the Preface before my Answer*. Lastly I have no more to request of him, but only to remember the new Title under which the first Treatise, and them which followed, were published, which is; *The Perpetuity of the Faith of the Catholick Church touching the Eucharist*. For what else can be expected from a man that promises to make us confess, *the Church of Rome's Belief is the same with that of all Antiquity*, and hopes to convince us of the Truth of this, but that he should invalidate all our Proofs of matters of Fact, by which we think we have established the reality of an Innovation? Would Mr. Arnaud grant me the favour to suppose a while that I am not obstinate: and I will likewise on the other hand suppose I was mistaken in Mr. Aubertin's Book, and that the Perswasion I had of the truth of his Proofs concerning an Innovation hath bin false. Now should the Author of the *Perpetuity* pretend, that his Method is able to undeceive me and dissipate all the false Impressions which Mr. Aubertin's Proofs have wrought in my Mind; should he, I say, pretend to this, he has imagined, as I have already mentioned, that he is able by his Arguments, to invalidate our Proofs; and again on the other hand, if he pretends not to do this, he hath bin certainly to blame in saying, *He would convince Hereticks, and make them acknowledge, (if they are not Invincibly Obstinate) the Perpetuity of Transubstantiation, and the Real Presence*. We shall see by what follows, whether or no Mr. Arnaud has upheld the honour of so great a Design, or whether he has not abated something of it. I shall content my self at present with only shewing the pretension of the Author of the *Method*.

IT cannot be alleadged in his behalf, he had not these aforementioned Proofs in his Mind, but only offered his own; which he judged conclusive; for besides that when a man lays down a Method as sufficient to produce an effect, he ought consider whatsoever may hinder the producing of this or the contrary Effect. We may farther observe he assaults Mr. Aubertin's Book in this Treatise, wherein are contained these Proofs, concerning which he could not pretend Ignorance, seeing they make up the greatest part of that Book. It ought moreover to be considered, that he refuteth, as I already said in the foregoing Chapter, an Account whose whole strength is grounded on these Proofs of matters of Fact, an Account which taketh them for its Foundation, and borroweth from them whatsoever it would perswade, and refutes it not in opposing other Proofs after the same manner, but by Arguments. Whence it follows he imagins his Arguments are sufficient to overthrow these Proofs, it being impossible if they stand firm, but that the account of the Change or Innovation should do so too.

Mr. Arnaud's way of shifting the Question that he might draw on the Reader

Reader to another matter, is so plainly evident, that I need not give him the least hint of it. For there is certainly a great Difference betwixt barely *Opposing* Arguments against our Proofs, and pretending to invalidate them by Arguments. The first of these may be done without thinking on the second; these Arguments may be examined and compared with our Proofs, without any other Pretence than the keeping the Mind in Suspence, and hindering it from determining on either side. Had the Author of the *Perpetuity* kept himself within these Bounds, we should have answered him after another sort; but he hath extended his design so far as to bring us to a final Acknowledgment. The Question then is not so much about his bare Opposition; altho that shall be shewed him at length to be useless, and that he cannot expect any advantage from it, for the Debate at present consists either in the Justice or Injustice of his Design, when he imagined this Opposition was sufficient to convince us, notwithstanding our Prejudices against it, occasioned by Mr. *Aubertin's* and other Ministers Proofs.

BUT to state the Question clearly, it ought to be farther supposed, that we compare not here the Proofs drawn from Arguments, then when they are made use of to establish Matters argued, with Proofs of matters of Fact, which are intended for a confirmation of the same matters of Fact. For I am far from denying, but there may be at some times Proofs drawn from Arguments, which are as conclusive in their kind, and bring along with them as much certainty of Evidence, as Proofs of Fact do in theirs. The Debate concerns the comparing these two sorts of Proofs, in respect of a matter of Fact; for the Principal Question betwixt us, is whether the Doctrine of the ancient Church is the same with that of the Church of *Rome* at present, now this is a matter of Fact, which on one side is demonstrated by Proofs of Fact, and which the Author pretends on the other side to demonstrate by Proofs drawn from Arguments; which two sorts of Proofs form contrary Conclusions on the same subject.

IT is farther to be considered, the Question lies not in supposing our Proofs are frivolous, or uncertain, for then they might be opposed by Proofs drawn from Arguments; by pretending that the Fact would be more plainly demonstrated by this means than by the other. Had the Author of the *Perpetuity* made this Supposition and well grounded it, we could not any longer keep to our Proofs of Fact, of whose weakness and insufficiency he had already convinced us, we must then have hearkned to his Arguments. But we are not in this case, for he leaves our Proofs of Fact untouched in their whole strength, and we are persuaded of the truth and solidity of them. It being then thus with us, it remains to enquire, whether his Proofs drawn from Arguments can be sufficient to make us alter our Judgments. The Author of the *Perpetuity* pretends they are, and I deny them to be so, so that to decide clearly this Point, we must compare these two ways of Proving, one with another.

I affirm then first of all, our Proofs of Fact are regular and natural, as I made apparent in my second Chapter: whereas those of the Author of the *Perpetuity* are unjust and preposterous. Now to compare these two Methods one with another, that which is natural is least suspicious, for there can be nothing said against it, common Sense leads us to it, but the other is ever liable to Exception, by reason of its contrariety and obliquity. The

D

latter

latter of these leads a mans Mind by several Turnings and Windings, and the other makes it go straight.

MOREOVER, our Proofs of Fact demonstrate the matter immediately in it self; but Proofs drawn from Reason cannot do this, but by a Prospect thro other things, and by means of Connexions and Consequences; Now it cannot be denied, but of these two ways of knowing things, the one being immediate, and the other mediate; the one near, and the other distant, but that the first of these is the most distinct and certain: for not to say, that the Ideas of things grow weak, when they are discovered by a Medium, and that the Mind is more attentive, and so by consequence more distracted, and less able, when it is forced, to apply it self at the same time to three different Objects, *viz.* on the Conclusion, Principle, and Dependance which the Conclusion hath on its Principle, than when it hath but one only Object to consider; besides this I say, the orderly Connexion of things being less known to us than the things themselves, it is easier to take for a Consequence what is not one, than to take one thing for another. It is easier to deceive us by affirming, if an Alteration hath hap'ned, there must such and such Accidents have followed it, than it is by only telling us, *Loe here the Alteration*, and certainly a man is in less danger of being deceived this way than the other.

WHEN two Methods are offered as proper to demonstrate a Question in Debate, it seems to me, that a mans Reason will incline him to choose that way which brings him to the consideration of the Point debated in all its several Relations and Circumstances, rather than that which shews it him but in one. The Mind must be permitted to make several Reflections, because divers Reflections strengthen one another, and uniting together, they form a more extended and perfect Knowledge, even as several Rayes united give the greater Light. Now it cannot be denied but our Proofs of Fact have this Advantage over them of the *Perpetuity*. For the latter of these respects no farther than the only impossibility of an Alteration; and concludes from thence, that the Doctrine of the Antient Church hath bin the same with that of the Church of *Rome* at present. But our Proofs examine the Belief of the Antient Church, in all the ways it can be examined in it self, by its necessary Consequences, by its Consequences of Congruity, by way of Negation, and Affirmation, by Circumstances of Time, Places, Persons, and Occasions, and in a word, after all manners imaginable, whereby the Mind may form a more solid and certain Judgment. What likelihood is there then, that being already perswaded by a considerable number of Proofs, which this Method draws from all these Particulars, we should receive a contrary Impression by the Author of the *Perpetuity's* Arguments?

A greater humane Certainty than that of Sense cannot be found, now that of Reasoning falls commonly under this Degree, especially when we apply it to matters of Fact.

BUT when Proofs drawn from Arguments shall be extended to the same Degree of Conviction, as those of the Eye-sight, and common Sense, they can never ascend higher, or proceed so far as to convince us, and make us renounce their Evidence. It seldom happens that these two Lights justify one another, but when this falls out, a mans Mind never fails of taking



ing one part or the other, it may remain for some time interdicted and astonished; but unless some vain Philosophy, as that of the *Academicks*, or *Pyrrhoniens* has corrupted it, and made it wander; it will soon rally it self on the side of common Sense. I will produce an Example drawn from *Physicks*. Our Eyes and Sences shew us that a grain of Sand is not only finite, but far less than a Mountain, or the whole Globe of the Earth; yet there are People who endeavour to demonstrate by the force of their Arguments, that this little grain of Sand comprehends an infinite number of Parts actually existent, because it may be divided *ad infinitum*, and it is not, say they, well conceivable how a thing can be so divided, if there be not in it actually an Infinity of Parts, seeing each Division suppoeth the actual Existence of its Parts, from whence it seems, that this grain of Sand is as bigg as a Mountain, and the whole World besides, it being impossible, say they moreover, there should be a greater and larger heap than that which actually contains an Infinity of Parts. I doubt not but a mans Mind would be soon entangled in this Labyrinth, but he would extricate himself thence, not by the help of his Senses but his Reason, he will turn it on every side, and invent Distinctions which will signifie nothing, as are the greatest part of them which have bin made on this Subject; yet will he still keep firm to his Eye-sight and common Sense.

IT will be replied perhaps, that unless we are extream Obstinate, we cannot pretend our Proofs of Fact are of this kind, which is to say, that they have the certainty of our Senses; for they are taken from the Testimony of the *Fathers*, whose Faithfulness may be called in question, by setting up this fantastical *Hypothesis*, mentioned by Mr. *Arnaud*, which is, *That all our Passages are false, and invented by the Disciples of John Scot*, or else in saying, that the *Fathers* are mistaken, or some such like matter, which may make the Truth and Validity of these Proofs to be called in Question; and moreover that our Passages are not so plain, but they may well be questioned, seeing there have bin great Volumes written concerning them on both sides. To which I answer, in supposing two things which seem to me, to be both undeniable by Mr. *Arnaud*, we can pretend against him our Proofs of Fact have such a kind of Certitude, as is that of our Senses.

MY first Supposition then shall be, That the Writings of the *Fathers* are faithful Witnesses of the Belief of the Antient Church. He cannot disagree with me in this Point, for we have not receiv'd it but from them of the Church of *Rome*, they produce it themselves, and we use it only out of Condescension to them, not having need, as to our own particular, of any thing but the Word of God to regulate our Faith in this Mystery of the *Eucharist*. And when this Point should be questionable, yet must then the Author of the *Perpetuity* put it out of Question by his refuting of it, before he proposes to us his Arguments, and not having done it, we are at liberty to act against him on this Principle. The other Supposition we must make is, That we know very well, what is the Church of *Romes* Belief touching the *Eucharist*, and that we rightly apprehend it, so that there is no danger of our Mistake in this matter, and this is that which hath never yet bin disputed against us. In effect, we neither say, nor imagine any thing on this Subject, more than what we find in Books, and hear discoursed on every Day, which is, that the whole Substance of Bread is really converted into the Substance of the Body of *Jesus Christ*, and the whole Substance of Wine into the whole Substance of his Blood, there not remaining any thing more of the Bread

and Wine but their meer Accidents, which are not sustained by any Subject; and further, that the Substance of our Saviour's Body, is really present at the same time both in Heaven and Earth, on all the Altars whereon this Mystery is celebrated: that they which communicate, eat and drink this Substance with the Mouths of their Bodies, and that it ought to be Worshipped with the Adoration of *Latria*. This is undeniable.

I say then, on these Grounds, we have reason to presume our Proofs of Fact are evident even to Sense it self. For we read the several Passages of the *Fathers* which speak of the *Eucharist*, our Eyes behold them, and our Senses are Judges of them. But there are not any of these Articles to be met with, which do distinctly form the Belief of the *Roman Church*, neither in express Terms, nor in equivalent ones. We are agreed in the Contents of these Articles, and in what they mean; we are likewise agreed of the Place where they were to be found, in case the Antient Church had taught them. We know likewise, that it belongeth to our Eyes and common Sense to seek them, and judge whether they are there, or no; for when a Church believes and teaches them, she explains them distinctly enough to make them understood, and we must not imagine they lie buried in far-fetched Principles, or couched in equivocal Terms which leave the Mind in Suspense; or wrapt up in Riddles, from whence they cannot be drawn but by hard Study. If they are in them they ought to be plain, according to the measure and Capacity of an ordinary and vulgar Understanding. Yet when we seek them, we cannot find 'em: if they were set down in express Terms, our Eyes would have discovered them; had they bin in Equivalent ones, or drawn thence by evident and necessary Consequences, common Sense would have discovered them. But after an exact and thorow Search, our Eyes and common Sense tell us, they are not to be found in any manner. This altho a Negative Proof, yet is it of greatest Evidence and Certainty. After the same manner as when we would know whether a Person be at home, we are agreed both touching the House and the Person, that one might not be taken for the other; and after an exact Search, if a mans Eyes and Senses tell him that he is not there, the proof of a Negative Fact hath all possible Force and Evidence. Yet we are upon surer Terms, for a man may easily hide himself in some corner of his House, and steal away from the sight of those that seek him; and therefore the Negative Proof serves only in this Respect, to justify we have made a full and thorow Search. But if the Articles of the *Romish Creed* were established in the universal Consent of all Ages, (as is pretended,) it would not be sufficient they were hid in some one of the *Fathers* Writings, they must near the matter have appeared in all of them; whence it follows, our Negative Proof is yet more certain, by the Confirmation it receives from an Affirmative Proof, which consisteth in that our Eyes and Senses find out many things directly Opposite to these Articles, and these two Proofs joyned together do form one, which appeareth to be so plain and intire, that there needs nothing to be added to it. And yet this is it which the Author of the *Perpetuity* doth pretend to strip us of by his Arguments. But let him extend his Pretensions as far as he will, I believe he will find few Persons approve of them, and who will not judge, that even then when our Eyes should have deceived us, which is impossible after so diligent and careful a Search, the only means to disabuse us would be; to desire us to return to the using of them again, and to convince us our Inquiry hath not bin sufficient, we should at least have bin shewed what we our selves were not able to find.

For

For whilst nothing is offered us but Arguments, they will do us no good, we may be perhaps entangled with them, if we know not how to answer them, but they will never make us renounce the Evidence and Certainty which we believe to be contained in our Proofs of Fact.

WE are confirmed in this Belief, when we consider the Nature of the Author of the *Perpetuity's* Arguments. For they are not Demonstrations which convince a mans Mind, or of equal force with them which appear in our Proofs; being at farthest but mere Probabilities. They are Moral Impossibilities which he finds in the Alteration we suppose, as tho it were not possible but that the Bishops and others of the Clergy, together with the People, would have opposed these Innovations, and disturbed the Peace and Unity of the Church, under so great a Contrariety in their Opinions; and many such like things doth he alledge, which are not grounded on any certain Principles, nor drawn from undeniable Consequences. In general, its a hard matter to determine which are impossible Events, if you except them which carry along with them a palpable Contradiction; for the Causes or Principles of things are at a great distance from us, we know little of them but by their Effects, and these Effects not always shew themselves at the Bottom, so that a man cannot positively say, this can be, or this cannot be. Moral Impossibilities are for the most part doubtful, especially those grounded on the Inclinations of the People, whose ways are many times so uncertain, and have so little of Uniformity in them, and so great Dependance on particular Circumstances, that we cannot take any certain Rules from thence. Had the Author of the *Perpetuity* shewed us, That the Alteration we speak of, doth imply a Contradiction, That 'tis contrary to the Nature of things, That there follows from it evident and intolerable Absurdities, we should then have examined his Arguments without troubling our selves with his Method. But to tell us what the Clergy and People would do in this, this can amount to no more, at farthest, but meer Conjectures, and even Conjectures very uncertain; for he is not the Arbitrator of all humane Actions, neither doth he know all their Principles and different Interests, nor understands all the Causes which concur in great Accidents, or all those things which hinder them from hap'ning.

IT is then a great piece of Injustice to desire, our Proofs of Fact should yield to his way of Reasoning, and I hope Mr. *Arnaud* will not take it ill that in making use of his own Terms, and accomodating them to my Subject, I tell him, *That 'tis in vain that he contesteth, and beateth himself about this Subject of an Alteration. Arguments signifie nothing in matters which are obvious to Sense, and we can make them appear to be so in this Case.*

Lib. 10. Ch. 7.  
Pag. 55

IT remains, for the finishing of this Chapter, I should satisfy some of Mr. *Arnauds's* minute Observations. The first of which is, *That it is every* Lib. 1. Ch. 1. P. 10.  
*whit as bad to oppose vain Arguments against Proofs of Fact which are firm and solid, as to object solid and convincing Arguments against vain and Frivolous Proofs.* But there is no body who doubts of the Truth of this, and this is not the matter in Question. When he shall have made it appear our Proofs are vain and frivolous, he shall be permitted to oppose against them his Arguments: Yea, and call them solid and convincing ones, 'till such time as they be refuted. But our Proofs must always be begun withal, their  
weakness




weakness and vanity laid open, for without this we shall still be at liberty to hold them for good, firm and Conclusive.

HE addeth, *That not only Proofs of Fact are Invalidated by Proofs of Reasoning; But likewise, that Proofs of Fact are reducible in some sort to Proofs of Reasoning; and even all of 'em grounded on Arguings like unto those of the Author of the Perpetuity, that is to say, on the impossibility of certain Events, and that 'tis from these Arguings they borrow whatsoever they have of Solidity.* And this he proves by the Example of the literal Proofs taken from History, to establish certain matters of Fact, and by the Proofs of Moses's Miracles, and the Resurrection of our Saviour; concerning which the humane Certitude depends on a Moral Impossibility, which yet is not perceivable but only by force of Reasoning. From thence he concludes, *That a Proof is not to be Rejected, because it is called a Proof drawn from Reason; no more than it is to be believed, because 'tis called a Proof of matter of Fact; but that both one and the other are contemptible, or estimable, accordingly as they are Obscure or Evident, True or False, Slight or Solid, and that 'tis on the Quality of a Proof and not by its Kind, we ought to form our Judgment.*

TO which I answer, we must distinguish two kinds of Proofs of Fact, the one Immediate, the others Mediate; the Immediate depend on our Senses, the Mediate consist in the Deposition of Witnesses. The certainty of the first of these doth not depend on Arguments, it being evident in it self by its own Nature and Original; for in that we believe our Senses; this Perswasion cometh not simply from Reasons dictating this to us; but because their Testimony is perswasive in it self, and that we cannot doubt of the things we see, unless we have corrupted our own Natures by a strange Extravagancy.

AS to the second kind of Proofs, we must consider them either absolutely, or in their Circumstances; if absolutely it is clear, their Certitude dependeth on Arguments, for we do not give Credit to Witnesses, but only upon the account that Reason dictateth we ought to believe them. Yet doth not this hinder them from being commonly stronger, in respect of the Fact they prove, than the Reasoning grounded on the same matter of Fact; and that which distinguisheth them is not their simple kind, but the Matter, or Subject to which they are applyed, seeing that an Argument is more Just and Certain, when it establisheth the Fidelity of Witnesses, than when it would decide the Fact it self concerning which the Witnesses make their Depositions, whence it follows that the Testimony authorized by stronger Arguments, ought to be preferred before those which are weaker. And after this manner do we prove the Truth of our Saviour's Resurrection, because the Testimony of the Apostles, being grounded on mighty Arguments, stands more firm, than all that the Wit of man is able to devise against it. But if the Proof taken from Witnesses is attended with this Circumstance, that is to say, that the Fidelity of the Witnesses be agreed upon, and that this be an acknowledged and uncontrollable Principle, then, I say, this is no longer a Mediate Proof, but an Immediate one, it depending no longer on Arguments. For the Validity of a Testimony being a Point once decided, which ent'reth not into the Proof, but only as an undoubted Principle, it then remains only to know what the Witnesses depose, and this is a Matter of which we may be informed by our Senses,  
whence



whence it follows, we must examine their Testimony, and that this way is to be preferred before that which is Argumentative on the same Fact.

IF we consider the *Fathers*, not in respect of their own Belief, but as Witnesses of the common Belief of the Church, I confess, their Authority dependeth on Reasonings, and that it may be questioned; but besides, it would not hence follow that the Proofs drawn from Arguments in this matter, that is to say, on the Churches Belief, would be more certain than their Testimony, seeing their Testimony may be established on a Reasoning stronger than these Proofs, and consequently may be preferable to them. I say, besides all this, this Point of the Fidelity of the *Fathers* is a Principle; we have the Advantage of supposing against Mr. *Arnaud*, seeing that hitherto the Church of *Rome* hath never questioned it, and that we take the *Fathers* only from his Hands, and descend to the Examination of their Testimony only out of compliance with him, as I have already mentioned: so that to speak properly, we have no more to do, but only to know what hath bin their Doctrine. Now this is another matter of Fact, of which we think we can be informed by our Eyes, and by the Light of common Sense, and we cannot imagine without a great Mistake, that there hath bin more perspicuity and certainty, in the Proofs drawn from Arguings; whence I may conclude again, that we are at Liberty to reject these Proofs, without troubling our selves with any farther Examination of them.

IT appeareth then clear enough (I think) that Mr. *Arnaud's* second Chapter is but a vain Amusement. And I cannot but be troubled, finding my self obliged to alleadg several things which cannot but be grievous to them who shun Contention. But I could not but mention them, to follow Mr. *Arnaud*, to the end he might not take Advantage by my leaving him unanswered.

WHAT he saies concerning pretended Proofs of Fact, viz. That they are often invalidated by Proofs fetched from Arguments, toucheth not our Question. For there is no body denys that Reason doth not sometimes correct a Mistake in Sense; and sometimes again invalidates the Deposition of Witnesses, whether by making it appear that these are False-Witnesses who impose on us, or else in shewing they themselves are mistaken, or lastly that their Testimony contains quite another thing than what is pretended. But altho that Proofs of Fact ought to be tried by Arguments, to know their Goodness, yet doth it not follow that when the Question respects a matter of Fact, but that the way of Proofs is to be preferred before that of Arguments, on the same Subject; it doth less follow that when Persons are prevented by Proofs of Fact, that they can be made to alter their Judgments, by simple Proofs drawn from Arguments, without shewing them that their pretended Proofs of Fact are not good. What he addeth concerning the Proofs of Fact, that they are all of 'em reducible in some sort to Proofs of Reasoning, is not true, in reference to immediate Proofs, and whatsoever there may be of Truth in this, yet is it useless, because the Question is not about a general Comparison of Arguments with Proofs of Fact, but concerning the Comparison applyed to the Fact it self, which the Proof establisheth, and which lies now in Debate. All the following Discourses, touching the Fidelity of Historians, the Battle of *Canes*, of *Pharsalia*, of *Philippe*, *Actium*, *Caesar*, *Pompey*, and the City

*City of Constantinople*, are Digressions which our Dispute hath nothing to do with. The Proofs of the Truth of *Moses's* Miracles, and them of the Resurrection of our Saviour, are good, but they belong not to our Subject. If the Question concerned the proving the Fidelity of the *Fathers* Testimony, we would consent to the making use of Arguments, after the same manner as they are made use of to prove the Fidelity of *Moses* and the Apostles Testimony. But this is not the Point, our whole Question is only to know what the *Fathers* have believed; and for this, Arguments are far less fit than Passages faithfully collected from their own Writings. Mr. *Arnauld's Hypothesis*, that all our Quotations of the *Fathers* have bin soyfted in them by *John Scot* and his Followers, is, as he is pleased to express it on another Occasion, a *Fantastical Hypothesis*, from whence he can draw no Advantage, and what at farthest can have no Ground but in the Disquisition of the Passages themselves. And lastly his Conclusion that the Proofs of Fact, and the Proofs taken from Arguments, are either to be valued or slighted, as they are either Obscure or Evident, False or True, Vain or Solid, and that 'tis by the Quality of the Proof, and not by the kind of them that we must judge, this is I say a disingenuous Conclusion, for it is true that Proofs are estimable or despicable by their Quality, and not by their Kind: but their Kind and the Matter to which they are applied serve to foreshew us their Quality, and their Quality being foreknown, rendreth them Estimable or Contemptible. A Proof drawn from Arguments, being made use of to subvert a matter of Fact, which is found established by the sight of our Eyes and common Sense, bears, in this simple Comparison, a sufficient Number of false Characters, to make us conclude that it belongs to the number of those subtle and loose Proofs Mr. *Arnauld* mentions, which evaporate of themselves, and vanish out of the Mind, as the *Ayr* doth out of our Mouths, it not being necessary to enter into a more particular Examination of them. Seeing then we have Reason to suppose our Proofs are good and Substantial, as I made it apparent in my first Chapter, we may likewise well conclude in this, that the Author of the *Perpetuity's* Reasonings are vain and groundless, and consequently to be rejected without troubling our selves any farther with them.

Lib. I. C. 2.  
P. 10.

## CHAP. IV.



## CHAP. IV.

*My fourth Observation Justifi'd; viz. That we need but oppose our Proofs of Fact against the Author of the Perpetuity's Arguments, to make them Invalid.*

**I**T will be needless to prove this Observation, seeing Mr. *Arnaud* acknowledgeth enough to establish the Truth and Justice of it. *We do not in any wise pretend, saith he, to deny him (he means me) the use of his Proofs of Fact, (if he hath any) provided he makes a right use of them, and follows the Rules of Reason, in so doing. He may then conclude as long as he will, that the Alteration in Question is possible, in making it appear if he can, That it hath actually hapned. He may deny the Impossibility of a thing, by proving its actual Existence. All this is allowed him, neither are we so unreasonable, to deprive him of these kind of Proofs. He wrongs the Author of the Perpetuity, in charging him with such a Thought.* This Acknowledgment is not of so small Importance, but that it deserves to be considered; for it perfectly overthrows the Author of the *Perpetuity's* real Design, and makes all those great Hopes he conceived of his Method, to vanish away, in two or three Periods. We have already seen that he hath offered it, as a sufficient Means to convince us; and make us confess, by the Evidence of Truth, if we are not desperately Obstinate, that the Church of Rome's Belief touching the Mystery of the Eucharist, is the same with that of all Antiquity. But this Discourse do's not well agree with that of Mr. *Arnaud's*. For, if this Method will lead us so far on one Hand, as the making of us come to this last Confession, mentioned by the Author of the *Perpetuity*, the Dispute ends there, and our Proofs of Fact are Insignificant, seeing they are Succors which will stand us in no stead, being already overthrow'n. And on the other, if we may employ our Proofs of Fact against the Method, provided we make a right use of them; if we may deny the Impossibility of an Alteration, in shewing it hath actually hapned; we have at least the Power to Suspend this Acknowledgment, to which the Author of the *Method* would oblige us, until such time as it is examined whether we make a right Use of our Proofs of Fact, and draw a true Conclusion from them. But how shall we make these two Gentlemen agree? Seeing one of 'em would have the Dispute ended by his Arguments; and the other would have us keep it still up by our Proofs of Fact. The one pretends, we ought to reckon our selves Vanquished as soon as ever he has done speaking, and the other gives us time, and allows us to produce our Passages. If we Expound the Author of the *Perpetuity's* Meaning by Mr. *Arnaud*, he hath undertaken no more than the bringing us to make this forementioned Acknowledgment, Exclusively; for between his Proofs and our Confession, we may put in our Proofs of Fact, which is to say in short, that he hath supposed his Method able to effect any thing, but what it ought. And if we expound Mr. *Arnaud's* Meaning, by that of the Author of the *Perpetuity*, he designs, that we shall not make use of our Proofs of Fact till such time as we acknowledg there hath no Alteration hapned; which is to say, that he will not grant us the use of them, til we

E

confess

confess, they are of no use to us. So that should we comply with both these Gentlemen, we oppose and contradict our selves; for we must then acknowledg that we have bin to blame, and yet at the same time maintain that the Reason is on our side: And so again we shall acknowledg, the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome* is the same with that of the Primitive Church, and yet still prove that there hath bin made an essential Alteration. And thus are we guided by these Gentlemens Speculations.

TO speak ingenuously, I take Mr. *Arnaud* to be a very bad defender of the *Method*; for he not only forsakes it in a Capital Question, wherein its Honour is chiefly concerned, (which is to know whether it be sufficient to Convince us in the State we are in, and make us confess the Truth of what it proves) but he moreover exposes the Usefulness and Vanity of it; for if after all his Endeavours, we may still return to our old Proofs of Fact, I see not any Use that can be made of it; unless it be to entangle and lengthen out our Debate, wherefore I think it may well be laid aside, and the Author of it content himself with his *Method of Discussion*.

Lib. 1. C. 3.  
P. 16.

NOW to clear up this Dispute, it will not be amiss to examine here, what Mr. *Arnaud* tells us touching these two sorts of Methods of *Prescription*, and *Discussion*. The *Method of Prescription*, saith he, is that in which, by the Examination of certain principal Points, the Controversy is decided, the other is that in which is particularly laid down the Proofs of all the Matters debated, and all the Objections against them answered. From thence he takes occasion to discourse of the Advantages which the Church hath over us by these Methods of *Prescription*; and afterwards coming to a Conclusion, It is necessary addeth he, For the *Method of the Prescriptions* keeping its Advantages, and producing the Benefit expected from it, that it remain separate from the *Method of Discussion*, because otherwise we should inevitably fall into *Prolixity*, and the *Perplexity* of particular Examinations, which we intend to avoid. So that, whereas the Discourses designed for the *Discussion* of particular Matters, ought to be written with the greatest Exactness, no difficulty, which may perplex the Mind being omitted in them; So on the contrary, those which are made according to the *Method of Prescription*, ought precisely to contain no more than may serve to illustrate the Proof which a Man intends to make use of, and it would certainly be a great Defect to joyn thereunto the Examination of particular Questions, which do but confound the Mind by their Multiplicity. At length he concludes, That the Author of the Perpetuity could not with Prudence undertake to answer Mr. *Aubertin's* chief Difficulties in his Treatise. That had this Treatise bin made according to the *Method of Discussion*, he had bin in a manner obliged thereunto, but being a *Method of Prescription* he could not do it without spoiling his Design, and evidencing he understood not the Nature and Advantage of the Method he followed, which was short, perspicuous, and accommodated to all Capacities.

ALL this Discourse is nothing to the Purpose, for by it we understand no more than this, that when men consent to make use of the *Method of Prescription*, they must only serve themselves with it according to the Rules which it enjoyneth. Very good! But this decides nothing if we are not agreed, but on the contrary, dispute against it, for then the Question is no longer, how we ought to use the *Method of Prescription*, nor whether it ought to be joyned with that of *Discussion*, this is no longer the Point, but the Question is only whether we ought to use it or not. Mr. *Arnaud* perpetually.

petually imposes on his Readers, he carries them off from one place to another, from the matter in Question, to that which does not concern it, and thereupon entertains them at his Ease. We do not dispute the manner after which the Author of the *Perpetuity* ought to have ordered his Method of Prescription, supposing this were a proper Place for it, this is one of Mr. *Arnaud's* Delusions; but our Dispute lies, whether he could reasonably use it against our Proofs, even so far as to promise the Effect which he hath pretended to draw from thence. Now this is a Difference which hath bin already dispatched by what I represented in the foregoing Chapters. And in effect, seeing he would convince us there hath bin no Alteration made touching the *Eucharist*, notwithstanding we are prepossessed to the Contrary, by literal Proofs, how can he, I say, take from us this Perswasion, and give us another quite contrary to it, unless his Method of Prescription hath an Evidence and Certainty beyond that of the Proofs aforementioned? This he ought to shew us, and not straggle into the common place of Methods of Prescription. But this would be to undertake to shew a thing impossible; for a Method made up of Proofs taken from Arguments: all of 'em drawn from a *genere probabili*, as the Schools term them, could not surmount the strength of our Proofs of Fact, which depend on the sight of our Eyes and common Sense, a great part of which propose the thing immediately in it self.

BUT how then? may we never establish our Sentiments by a Method of Prescription? We do not say so. We only mean thus much, that when the Sentiments of Persons are opposed, which are grounded on Proofs of Fact, and which they believe to be (as I have already said) as certain as any thing which falls under the Judgments of their Senses, it is then I say an unreasonable thing, to pretend to make them alter their Opinion by a Method of Prescription, grounded on moral Impossibilities. This is the Knot of the Question. If a man hath to do only with People prepossessed in favour of his Opinion, he may then use his Method of Prescription, to confirm them in the thoughts they have already entertained. There could nothing be alledged against his manner of Proceeding, the strength of his Proofs are in that Case only to be considered. If he has to do with indifferent Persons, that is to say, with such who have not yet taken any side, and desire to be instructed, he might then likewise use a Method of Prescription, provided his Principles be well grounded, and his Conclusions more decisive, than any thing which can be alledged against them; There need then be nothing to be replied, unless there were something indirect in his Method; but this could do no more at farthest, but only oblige People to examine with greater Care the Truth of his Principles, and that of its Consequences, and not make them reject them; for indirect Arguments conclude sometimes with as great Evidence as direct ones. Nay I will not fear to say, that when he should have to do with Persons prepossessed with Opinions contrary to what he would perswade them, he might then lawfully use a Method of Prescription, for it would not be sufficient to say that a man is prepossessed by another Method, nor object that that of Prescription proceedeth indirectly, or follows not the Order of Nature, these kind of Objections may cause Suspicion; but they ought not to proceed so far, as to make men absolutely reject Arguments, which perhaps, are attended with a greater Perspicuity and Certitude, than those which have occasioned the Prejudice. But as to what concerns us, against whom the Author of the *Perpetuity* hath written, we are in none of these Circumstances; being not only



led by a natural and direct Way in my *Hypothesis*, and by Proofs which propose us the Point in Question immediately in it self; but by Proofs which we believe to be above all Contradiction, and yet he would have us change our Minds, by Proofs which are not only indirect and mediate ones, and which at farthest can amount to no more but meer Probabilities, being applied to the Subject in hand. We have then Reason to say, that these are meer Chimeras in our respect, and that without considering them any otherwise than in their own kind, and in the matter on which they treat, they cannot make such a strong Impression on us, as to deface that which we have already received; for 'tis not likely that any rational Man will be more affected with Probabilities, than with solid Proofs which are grounded on common Sense.

MOREOVER this is not the proper Place to make Comparisons, of the Methods of *Protestants* with them of the Church of *Rome*. It may be made apparent that we have surer and shorter ones than those which it proposeth. But this is not our Question, and I am resolved not to follow all Mr. *Arnauds* fruitless Digressions. His Words cost him nothing, and People are disposed to receive them, be they what they will, as Oracles. But 'tis not the same with me, for, should I wander from my Subject as often as he does, there would be few Readers who would not be tired with our Debate. I shall only tell him, he is mistaken when he imagines that to be of our Communion, a man is obliged to an examination of all the Controversies which to this day have perplexed the Christian Religion. We have the holy Scriptures which every man may read, or hear them read publicly: Which do fully and clearly contain whatsoever is necessary to Salvation, and by the Concurrence of Gods Grace, even the most illiterate may judge whether the Minister, under whom they live, is able and willing to shew them the way of Life, and whether our Society be the true Church. For in this Case we need but examine two things. The first whether we are taught in it all things clearly contained in the Word of God, and secondly, if there be nothing taught which corrupteth the Strength and Efficacy of these things; for if we find in this Communion wherewithal to satisfy our Consciences, and to live in the fear of God, and to ascertain our selves in our Saviours Promises: and moreover, if nothing be taught or practised which overthroweth the fundamental Doctrines of *Christianity*. For if nothing doth offend the Conscience, we ought to be perswaded, we are in the true Church, it being needless for us to enter into a Discussion of all the Errors which have troubled, or still perplex the *Christian* Religion. After the same manner as 'tis not necessary to Salvation, for a man to know all the particular Heresies which have troubled the Peace of the Church, nor to make a formal and positive Renunciation of them, for it is sufficient that we are not tainted with any of them, and firmly to believe the fundamental Truths of Religion, neither is it likewise necessary to assure our selves, we are in the true Church, that we inform our selves of the several Opinions of men: It may suffice us to know that the Church of which we are Members, teacheth what it ought, concerning Gods Glory and our Souls Edification, and maintains nothing which doth not answer these Ends. Now this every man may find in our Church, for if he compare his Ministers Doctrine with the Word of God, he will be satisfied that what he teacheth is exactly contained therein, he shall perceive likewise that we mix no Doctrines of men with it, which overthrow its Foundation. This way of Examination is short, easy, and proportionable to the Capacity of

of all People, and thereupon there may be made a Judgment, as certain as if every single Controversy had bin examined apart.

THE most simple then among us may live in perfect Peace; But it is not so in the Church of *Rome*; for these Methods of *Prescription*, mentioned by Mr. *Arnaud*, are not built but upon one of these two Principles, either that the Church, which is to say, the Body of the People, cannot err, nor cease to be the true Church, in ceasing to believe what it believes, or in beginning to believe that which it did not believe; or that the representative Church, that is to say, the *Councils*, or the *Pope*, cannot err. The first of these two Principles is natural; the second is of a Supernatural Order. I handle not at present this Point, whether they are false or true at the Bottom, it sufficeth me to say that they are in their own Nature so difficult and require so much time, that to expect ordinary Apprehensions to examine them, is plainly to deride them: I shall speak of the first of these in the sixth Chapter: where I shall make it appear that 'tis impossible for a man to extricate himself out of those Perplexities wherein the Author of the *Perpetuity* engages him, or to rest secure on the Grounds on which it's built. It suffices me to say, that People are not commonly so regular in things, which they believe by a distinct Faith, but that they are willing likewise to receive new Doctrines, and enlarge by this means the number of popular Mysteries. The Author of the *Perpetuity* tells us, that the Truths of Divine Grace were never popular in all the Consequences drawn from Theology: and yet we know that all imaginable care has bin taken to make these Consequences popular. There has bin made on this Subject, I know not how many Books adapted to Womens Capacity; there have bin Catechisms compiled, intirled Catechisms of Grace. Which evidently shew, it has bin believed, that it was not impossible to make the People receive by way of Illustration or Addition, Articles which they knew not before, whence it follows it has bin supposed they are capable of Change; for else to what purpose serve these Catechisms, if the People cannot of themselves, either diminish, or augment the number of Mysteries which they hold by a distinct Faith. This Principle is not then so certain, but that it may be doubted of, nor so clear, or evident in it self, that the most simple may be ascertained in it, having before their Eyes a Matter which appeareth so contrary to it.

AS to the second, it is evident that the Question of the Infallibility of Councils, or Popes, is not so easie, that the most simple People may master it. All Societies separate from the Church of *Rome* oppose it. If this Church hath this, she hath it by a particular Priviledg, which must be examined before it be received. For it cannot be entertained on the bare word of this Church, without falling into an extravagancy and ridiculous Circle, which is, that we believe the Church of *Rome* to be Infallible, because she saies so; and we believe what she saies in this matter to be true, because she is infallible. Before that the most simple People can acquiesce in its Authority, this Authority must also appear to them to be undeniable, by things independent on the Church of *Rome*, and which may be judged of distinctly by themselves. Otherwise this would be to begin an Argument by its Conclusion. For this would be near the matter such a kind of reasoning as this is. That the Church of *Rome* is Infallible in what she saith; now she affirmeth she is infallible, from whence it follows that she is so. A person in whom we suppose there is the least Dram of Sense, will never be convinced

vinced by this Argument. The Church of *Rome* then must first make out its privilege of *Infallibility* to the most simple man living, before it can be supposed that such a one, or any other will receive its Doctrine, founded on this Principle. Now I affirm that this Disquisition is beyond the reach of mean Capacities, for if it be proved by way of Scripture, it is not so plainly described therein, but that the Places on which it is grounded may be capable of another Sense. They are controverted Places, and a man must read whole Volumes to prevent his being rash or passionate in his Judgment. Now if a man be able to make such a Disquisition, and a Judgment accordingly, he will then be able to enter upon the Examination of particular Doctrines, and to discern the Conformity which each of 'em hath with the Scripture, in relation to what is produced on either side.

Lib. 1. C. 7. P. 66. NOW if this Doctrine be attempted to be proved by Arguments: he that endeavours to do this, engageth himself yet farther into tedious Prolixities, and Difficulties, which surpass ordinary Apprehensions. In a word Mr. *Arnaud* doth himself decide the Question. *This Infallibility*, saith he, *is not a thing clear in it self, seeing it dependeth only on the Will of God, which he hath made known unto us by the Scripture. The Church not being naturally Infallible, we must prove that it is supernaturally so, either by the Principles of Faith, or by a long Series of Arguments.* Ordinary Capacities are not able to examine this long sequel of Arguments, nor sufficiently to discuss the Principles of Faith, to discern if this pretended Infallibility may be drawn thence. And 'tis for this Reason, that the Author of the *Perpetuity* hath chosen rather to take the popular Infallibility for his Principle, than that of Priviledge. Mr. *Arnaud* testifies as much; for speaking of the Impossibility of the Churches altering its Belief on the Articles which are not popular, that is to say, of this Infallibility of Priviledg now in Question. *Reason*, saith he, *doth not clearly shew us this Impossibility.* So that this Author (meaning the Author of the *Perpetuity*) being desirous to ground his Arguments on a Principle of Reason and humane Evidence, and not on a Principle of Tradition and Authority, or on abstracted and remote Arguings, he must then necessarily contain himself within the reach of things, in which the Impossibility of a Change appeareth plainly by Reason. There are particular ways of proving that the Church never fell into an Error, on any Point which it proposeth. But it's evident to Sense, that the whole Church cannot fall into Errors, relating to matters of Faith, seeing they are distinctly known and understood by all the Faithful. The Infallibility then of Priviledge is not a thing which is immediately apparent to Sense, there needs more abstracted and remote Arguments to prove it, whence it appears that Persons of ordinary Capacities are not able to do this. Much less are they fit for this, should this Point be undertaken to be proved by the way of Tradition, for it would be to send them far enough, in obliging them to read the Fathers and Councils, to be informed in this matter; besides that the Fathers and Councils are themselves the representative Church, and whose Authority is now in Question and so consequently, their Testimony upon this account would signify nothing.

Lib. 1. C. 7. P. 68.

IT is then manifest, that common Apprehensions not being able to ascertain themselves in the Infallibility of *Priviledge*, as I come now from proving, nor in the Point of popular Infallibility, as I have already hinted, and which I shall do more fully in the end, they cannot remain in the Church  
of



of *Rome*, with a safe Conscience, there being nothing which holds them in it but deceitful Bands, such as are, Birth, Education, Interest, Custom, and the Example of others, which are things very improper to determine an honest Mind in matters of Salvation. They are then obliged to range themselves on the side of the Reformists, from whom they will receive for a Rule, things clearly contained in the Holy Scripture, and where they may be assured there is none of them withheld in the publick Ministry, and moreover, where there is nothing taught which corrupteth the Efficacy of Gods Grace. If it be replied, that we must first, satisfy such Persons by proving the Divinity of the Scriptures. I answer first, that this Principle doth not fall under Debate, seeing the matter in hand relates not to the several Religions in the World, but only to the particular Opinions of Christians, for they all in general acknowledg the Divine Authority of the Holy Scriptures. Secondly, I answer, that the Church of *Rome* is no less obliged to prove this Authority of the Scriptures, than other Churches, seeing that before she can make herself acknowledged as Infallible, she must evidence herself to be a Church, which she cannot do, if the Divinity of the Scripture be denied her, and she will not take the Pains to prove it; besides that all the Proofs by which she pretends to establish her Infallibility, depend either mediately or immediately on the Scripture, and consequently they suppose its Divinity. But in fine, I say the Characters of Divinity, which shine in all parts of these Writings, are so lively, and so many in Number, that the most ordinary Capacities cannot but be affected with them, if they apply themselves to the Consideration of them, with a pure Heart and unspotted Conscience. Now this is it, to which the meanest Capacity is obliged, as well as the greatest, and if they do it not, their Damnation is just, and their Impiety without Excuse.

AND this is what I thought I was obliged to speak, briefly on these pretended Methods of Prescription, this not being a proper Place to handle this Point more largely. But to return to the principal Subject of our Dispute, we are obliged to Mr. *Arnaud*, in that he takes it not ill, I endeavour to prove by several Passages, that the Alteration pretended to be impossible, is real and true. The Author of the *Perpetuity* must likewise consent to this, seeing Mr. *Arnaud* hath said it; and if he doth agree to it, he must suffer me to draw this Consequence, that I could have hindred the Effect he promised himself from his Method, which is, *to make us confess if we are not extreme Obstinate, that the Doctrine of the Church of Rome, touching the Sacrament, is the same with that of all Antiquity.* This Confession cannot be justly extorted from us, as long as there shall be any reasonable Occasion of disputing this Point between us, and the Production of some Passages of my Writings, starteth a particular Debate, which Mr. *Arnaud* approveth, for he only complains, I have not produced them in a right manner, but mained, and dislocated from their Consequences, and that I have concealed all those which might be opposed, and understood. But this Complaint is Unjust, and he should not conceal the Reason I alleaged to justify the form of my Abridgment, which is, That that Book was made in Relation to that of Mr. *Aubertins*, whose Proofs I take upon me to defend. If he did not like to insert *two large Volumes in Folio*, into a Preface, neither have I liked to put a great Volum into a short Answer, which contains no more than thirty Pages.

I never pretended that my Abridgment alone, should absolutely determine  
his

his Thoughts. I know this cannot be expected; but I was willing to shew the way which must be taken for the finding out of the Truth, which is to make an exact Search into the Belief of the Fathers; I design'd to shew them of my Communion, what might be objected against the Author of the *Perpetuity's* Arguments, and thereby obliged him to dispute henceforward in a regular manner, we may be permitted to make Abridgments of this kind, and that of mine hath nothing but what distinguisheth it from that which we call *A Heap of Difficulties*, the matters of Proof with which it is furnished, their Nature and Force, do contribute that Truth to it, which an Abridgment ought to have, and the relation it hath to Mr. *Aubertin's* Book makes it evident and certain. There can be nothing more required to conclude that the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, is not the same with that of the *Fathers*, and that there has bin made an Alteration, for the Principles of this are marked out, and their Consequence doth plainly appear, that exact perspicuity which ought ever to accompany Arguments is in the Book to which we refer the Reader; Mr. *Arnaud* need not conclude then, that there are Difficulties in the Doctrine of the *Eucharist*, for we may easily conclude from what I said, that the Doctrine of the Antient Church hath not bin the same with that which is taught at this Day by the Church of *Rome*. His Mistake lies in that he has only read these kind of Abridgments, which allways refer to another work, in supposing that the Principles they mark out are clearly established in that Book, to which they refer, and from whence they draw their Conclusion. And this is all that can be desired in this matter, but yet this is a way of concluding; and concluding too quite another thing than what Mr. *Arnaud* imagined, *viz. That there are Difficulties in the Eucharist*. I confess that to determine his Judgment, we must not regulate our selves only by this Conclusion, we must go to the Spring, and see whether what is supposed issues thence; but it doth not thence follow, that the Abridgment is in fault, nor that it should be esteemed as a *Heap of Difficulties*; and indeed it would not be an Abridgment, if in effect it did not abridge some other work, wherein the Matter is handled at large.

Lib. I. C. 4.  
P. 30.

*A Heap of Difficulties*, to speak properly, is a Collection of several Objections which are formed against a Doctrine, without examining either the Grounds on which this Doctrine is established, nor the Proofs or Arguments by which it is recommended, nor the Answers which may be made against these Objections, and in short, without supposing any other work wherein all these things are handled. It is certain that in a Controversy, this manner of proceeding is confused and captious, and ought not to make any Impression on a rational Mind. But it belongs to Mr. *Arnaud*, to say whether the Treatise of the *Perpetuity* is not of this Kind; for as to my part, I find that it hath all the Characters of it. For being a Collection of Objections against our Belief, touching the Change which hath happ'ned concerning the *Eucharist*, of moral Impossibilities heaped up one upon another, without any examination of the Grounds or Proofs of our Belief, nor of the Answers which may be made concerning these Impossibilities, and without any Supposition of another Work. For to tell us, as Mr. *Arnaud* doth, *that he sends us back to all the Catholick Books*, this methinks, seems to be a kind of shifting and evading, and is not sufficient to protect the Treatise of the *Perpetuity*, from that just Title I have given it of a *Heap of Difficulties*. Now if this Author meaneth all the Books written by Catholicks, when shall I be able to judge of them? This will be perhaps when I have

TUR

run thro above two hundred Volumes. And if I should say on the other side, that my Abridgment after the same manner, supposeth all the Protestant Books, and I lend all Persons to them; Our Readers without Question would be very well informed and edified.

BUT saies Mr. Arnaud, People do not use to call Matters which are perfectly handled, a Heap of Difficulties, but those things which are hard to be judged of, whereas the Author of the Perpetuity hath handled whatsoever relates to his Design in an orderly length. I answer first that this Author very imperfectly handles what respects his Design in General, which is to make us forsake our Belief, concerning the Church of Rome's changing the Primitive Doctrine: And secondly that he yet more imperfectly handles what respects his Design in particular, which is to shew the impossibility of a Change; for he does not consider of any Answer which may be given his Arguments: so that to speak truly, it is nothing else but a *Heap of Difficulties*. It can bear no other Title until such time as shall be published the two Volumes in Folio, which Mr. Arnaud mentions to us. We will receive them whensoever he will please to give 'em us; but we shall not be in haste to make that Confession, to which the Author of the *Perpetuity* hath promised to oblige us, till we have seen them; and in the mean time, because Mr. Arnaud will have it so, we will have once more the Pleasure, or rather the Pain of examining (altho it be needless) the Author of the *Perpetuity's* Proofs. I say because Mr. Arnaud would have it so, and not because the reason of the thing requires it; for what he alleageth concerning the *Passages of my Book*, that they contain but an indirect Answer to the Author of the *Perpetuity's* Argument, and therefore it is necessary immediately to examine what I have answered directly. This I say is not a sufficient Cause, we ought to see rather which of us two is first found in the Possession of this Argument, that is to say, which of us has bin first answered indirectly, and it will appear without doubt that it hath bin my self, seeing the Author of the *Perpetuity* hath assaulted Mr. Aubertin's Book, and that he hath assaulted it indirectly. Whence it follows that he ought at least to have begun by the Examination of our Proofs.

Lib. 1. C. 4.  
P. 31.

Lib. 1. C. 3.  
P. 24.

## F CHAP. V.



## C H A P. V.

*The pretended Advantages of Mr. Arnaud attributeth to the Treatise of the Perpetuity Examined.*

**A**LTHO the Conclusion which I have drawn from Mr. *Arnaud's* Confession, in the preceding Chapter, is clearly enough established, yet do I not think he will be satisfied, till I have examined what he saith in the fifth and sixth Chapters of his first Book. He will tell us without doubt, that it doth not hence follow we should defer the rendering our selves up to the Arguments in the *Perpetuity*, altho I have still the liberty of opposing against them our Proofs of Fact, and that this he hath clearly shewed in these two Chapters I last mentioned. Let us then see what he saies in them; and judge of them without Partiality.

Lib. 1. C. 5.  
P. 32.  
Mr. *Arnaud* immediately meets with a Difficulty, *For I much marvel*, saith he, *Mr. Claude has not observed when a point of Doctrine, as this in Question, is established on one side by considerable Proofs, and on the other by Proofs which are believed to be valid, that we must if we intend to judge aright, compare these contrary Proofs together, and prefer the strongest before the other; from whence we may conclude, that it will always be necessary to come to that which the Author of the Perpetuity will not yield to, which is, to examine our Proofs of Fact; For to solve this Difficulty, he supposeth, first, that they who read the Treatise of the Perpetuity, have their Sentiments already wholly formed on the Proofs of Fact, produced by Mr Aubertin and other Ministers; but that these Sentiments are not Uniform, because some judge of them from what they are in themselves, others by what they have heard of them, and by external Circumstances, which give them to understand what they ought to believe concerning them. That some do esteem them, others on the contrary slight them, and others again are in a Disposition of Indifferency. He afterwards represents us with a Calvinist or Religionary, (for so is he pleased to call us) who being dissatisfied with the Scripture and Fathers, by reason of the uncertainty wherein he findes himself, by harkning to different Voices, which call to him from all sides; and moreover less satisfied with the Divines of either Party, who cannot content him in the Solutions which they give to the Passages of their Adversaries; he thereupon turneth himself towards the Treatise of the *Perpetuity*, which shews him, that the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation* and the real Presence, have bin received by the *Greek* and *Latin* Churches, and in all other Societies, which are equally Enemies both to the *Latins* and *Greeks*, together with the Impossibilities which are in this insensible Change, which the Ministers have invented; whereupon this *Calvinist* determines, in forsaking all these Doubts, to believe the same which is believed thro out all the Earth, seeing the whole World would never believe it, if it had not derived this Faith from the Channel of Tradition. And for as much as this Contrivance could not be well ended, unless I were brought in as a Party, he therefore introduces me, with my *Aubertin* in my hand opposing this Resolution. But my Mouth is immediately stopt, being told, that these Proofs*

are

are Unsatisfactory, and thus am I sent away with my *Rhetorick* and *Enthusiasmes*.

BUT this being no more than a Supposition, it must be established. And for this Effect, Mr. *Arnaud* calls to his Assistance several learned Divines from *Germany*, *Switzerland*, *France*, and *Holland*, by whose Suffrage he concludes, that the Fathers are rather against us than for us, in what concerns the *Eucharist*, or that at least, the Proofs taken from Passages out of their Writings are very uncertain. And so here is already the understanding People among us convinced, and as for others that are not able to make a Judgment themselves, they must have recourse to Persons of greater Knowledge, by which means both the one, and the other, are obliged to render themselves up to that Evidence which appears in the Treatise of the *Perpetuity*, because our Proofs of Fact cannot be accounted by them, but as unevident and uncertain: and moreover this Treatise being fitted to all Capacities, and grounded on the Light of common Sense, it may be understood by all in general. This is the Summary of the fifth Chapter.

IN the sixth Chapter, he extends his Pretention a great way farther, for having gained the Learned and Unlearned to his side, he will not suffer even those who are obstinate amongst us to escape his Hands, *It not being necessary for this*, saith he, *to enter into an Examination of all those Passages, without which Mr. Claude would make us believe that the Treatise of the Perpetuity can prove nothing.* But lest this Pretention should at first amaze People, observe after what sort he declares his meaning. He saith then, that our Proofs of Fact appearing to us evident on one hand, and the Proofs of the Treatise of the *Perpetuity* on the other; these two contrary Evidences necessarily cause a suspension of our Judgments, and hinder us from determining, and throw us upon Doubts and Uncertainties. And thus far tends the Treatise of the *Perpetuity*, which leading us hither, Mr. *Arnaud* takes us in hand and tells us, we cannot any longer refuse to leave our Sect, and pass over to the *Catholick* Religion, first because the Church of *Rome* is the Maternal, Original, Successive, and *Catholick* Society, from which we must never make schisme. Secondly, because we must ever be fully convinced of this Churches Errors, before we separate from it, and at the same time have a full certainty of the Purity of that Society we are of, to keep in it. Thirdly, because the Church is in Possession of the Ministry, of the ordinary Vocation, and Authority, and that the Ministers who have not been above a hundred years standing, have none of these things. Fourthly, because that People of ordinary Capacities amongst us, being obliged to yield themselves to the Proofs of the *Perpetuity*, and consequently to return to the Church of *Rome*, they ought to serve for Examples to the Judicious, it being impossible for us all not to return to this Society, to which the greatest part of Men must necessarily belong. Lastly he confesseth, that all these Arguments suppose the Proofs of the Treatise are clear and substantial, and maintains that he may reasonably make this Supposition, to convince me I have no other way left to defend my self, than by shewing these Proofs of the Treatise are Invalid, and so by consequence I ought not to beat the Ayr as I have done, by declaiming against the Author of the *Perpetuity's* Method. Lib. 1. C. 6.  
P. 53.

AND thus have I Epitomiz'd these two mighty Chapters, in which Mr. *Arnaud* hath taken care to illustrate the glorious Designs of the Author

of the *Perpetuity*, and this perhaps being one of the most important Points in his whole Work, he has therefore spent thereupon the greatest part of his Wit and Eloquence. Yet howsoever it comes to pass I know not, we are so different in our Apprehensions, that having beheld the explication of all this curious Project, I have found nothing at all therein of Reason, nor coherence of Parts, neither in his Suppositions nor Consequences, and this I shall briefly and clearly manifest.

FIRST, methinks that Mr. *Arnaud* imposes on the World, in proposing as it were from us, a Difficulty, which weakens our Cause, altho it do's not concern us. For I do not pretend that one of our Communion, into whose Hands shall be put the Treatise of the *Perpetuity*, and who is able to read it, is absolutely obliged, before he forms his Judgment thereupon, to make a particular Comparifon of our Proofs, with those of that Treatise; I maintain that he may reject these last, by the general Consideration alone which he may make, without entring into the Examination of each Particular, because that in this general View he will find sufficient Grounds for rejecting them, *viz.* That they amount to no more but bare Probability, nor cannot equal our Proofs of Fact in Clearness and Solidity, which are grounded on common Sense. Whence it follows that the Proofs of this Treatise ought not to be admitted, and that if we take the trouble to examine them, 'tis out of Condescension, not Necessity.

IN the second place Mr. *Arnaud* has not exactly reckoned up the several ranks of Men, who may profitably read the Treatise of the *Perpetuity*. For the greatest part of them in our Communion, judging this Perusal needless, will not mind it, for they will neither have Leisure nor Curiosity enough for this; the Title alone will disgust them without proceeding any farther. But then he will say that these are unjust and obstinate Persons. *We believe it a Point of Rashness to judge of a piece of Ground before we have heard the Omners Experience of it; would it not then be a more inexcusable Rashness to pretend to judge of a Difference which respects our Salvation, by Arguments offered only on one side, in suffering our selves to be transported by the first Impressions? The least which ought to be done by them, who pretend to judge of Differences in Religion, is to hear both Parties, and weigh their Reasons.* I answer, that these Persons I mentioned, will act very Justly and Reasonably in doing what I said. For there being two Questions, the one touching what we ought to believe concerning the *Eucharist*, and the other touching what has bin believed by the Primitive Church. The first Question being once dispatched, we need not trouble our selves about the second. Now as concerning the Persons in our Communion, the first Question is solved to them by the Word of God. For this is the Fountain and Rule of our Faith. This is it which judgeth us all, and had the Author of the *Perpetuity* guided his Reasonings by this Principle, there is not one of us but would gladly hearken to him; but instead of this, he immediately tells us of nothing but the Consent of all Ages, and perswades himself, that henceforward the Ministers will be no more hearkened to, when they say in general, that we must only apply our selves to the Word of God.

THIS Question touching the Consent of all Ages, may be decided three ways, First, by the Rules of Christian Charity; Secondly, by the Confidence we ought to have in our Saviours Promises, and cares of his Providence; Thirdly, by an exact Knowledge of the History of all Ages.

Now



Now this last means being above the Capacity of most People, is needless. It is enough to a well meaning Person, that he sees in Scripture what he ought to believe, touching the *Eucharist*, and thereupon charitably presumes, that the Fathers have not deviated from this Faith into Capital Errors. It sufficeth him to believe that our Saviour's Promises to the Church; that he would never forsake it, have had their accomplishment, and whatsoever Clouds have fallen on the Ministration of it, by the mixture of mens Devices with Gods everlasting Truths, yet has our Saviour taken care to preserve the Faithful, and execute the Decree of his Election. So that such a one has no need to perplex himself with History, nor with reading over of three or four hundred Volumes, which will not yield him the least Satisfaction, much less need he entangle himself in the Author of the *Perpetuity's* Method, which is a fourth way the World hath yet never been acquainted with. When such a Person hears of Mr. *Aubertin's* Book, and the account he gives of the Change which hath hapned, I doubt not but he is glad to hear that even by this way, which is only proper to the Learned, the Truth he believes has bin illustrated, neither do I doubt but he believes with a humane Faith, what is told him concerning it; but we must not imagine that his Belief touching the *Eucharist* hath changed its Foundation, and left its Relyance on the Word of God, for it remaineth still where it was; so that when he should be questioned concerning the solidity of Mr. *Aubertin's* Proofs, or that of any other Minister, relating to this Subject, he will not be troubled about it, nor farther concern himself in these Debates, for he knows his Incapacity. He will content himself with a favourable Opinion of the Fathers, and with his Confidence in God, leaving these Debates to those that have Skill to manage them.

NOW as to such as condemn Mr. *Aubertin's* Book, I know none in our Communion of that number, and perhaps in the Church of *Rome*, there will be found as few of that Mind, if we except Mr. *Arnaud* and his Friends, who have given their Judgments about it, after a very slighting and peremptory manner. But I shall not take any farther Notice of this here, but continue my Observations. I do affirm then, I never yet had the Luck to meet with this wretched Calvinist whom he has described in such pitiful Strains. I was never yet told, *That the Scripture fills the Mind with Doubts, which it doth not resolve, and that such a Person finds the Writings of the Fathers Obscure, and that the Divines of either Party could not satisfy him, and there was nothing but the Arguments of the Perpetuity which could win his Heart.* Is not this such a Model of Calvinism as Mr. *Arnaud* desires, drawn from an Idea of his own Conceiving, and offered to them who would henceforward be of the number of its Profelytes. But what likelihood is there that any man to become Mr. *Arnaud*, or the Author of the *Perpetuity's* Profelyte, would Sacrifice the Scriptures, Fathers, and Divines of both parties to them. What Probability I say is there that their Pretention should so far prevail upon any man? Howsoever it be, it's an idle Fancy to imagine that a Person who is really of our Communion can fall into this Condition, and thereupon take up a Resolution of changing his Belief; and the Proof which Mr. *Arnaud* gives us is entirely faulty, for it can at farthest but conclude an Uncertainty, touching the *Fathers*, but not at all as it relates to the Word of God, from which a good man will never depart, even when he shall fall into Doubts touching the Opinions of the *Fathers*.

Lib. 1. C. 4.  
P. 34.

BUT let us see who these Persons are, who are represented to us float-  
ing

Lib. I. C. 5.  
P. 36.

ing on Doubts and Scruples. They are two sorts of Person, *the most knowing Ministers on one hand, and all the unlearned Calvinists on the other.* It is most False, saith Mr. Arnaud, that the most able Ministers are perswaded the Fathers are manifestly for them. To which he addeth, that all Protestants of mean Capacities, who are not able to make this Search, are rash in believing it, and cannot be perswaded of it but by a fond Humor. The former of these Points is grounded on slight Proofs. Observe here the first of them. *Lewis Lavater* relates that *Oecolampadius* began to doubt of the Truth of *Transubstantiation* and the *Real Presence*, in reading St. *Austins* Works; that he was strengthened in his Doubtings by reading of the Evangelists; that he immediately rejects his first Thoughts, by considering these Doctrines were generally entertained; yet being willing to overcome this weakness of Mind, he applyed himself to the reading of the Fathers; but could not be fully satisfied by them, because he oftentimes met in their Writings, with the Expressions of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Sacrament. Whereupon at length rejecting the Authority of men, he wholly applied himself to the Word of God, and then the Truth appeared more clearly unto him. This Testimony concludes nothing unless it be this, that it is not easy for a man that has imbibed the Principles of the Romish Church from his Infancy, to discover immediately the Truth, seeing that *Oecolampadius* who perceived the first Beams of it shining in St. *Austins* Works, and afterwards received deeper Impressions by reading of the Holy Scriptures, was puzzled by reading the Fathers, till such time as he wholly applied himself to the studying of the Word of God, by which he was put out of Doubt, and afterwards came more easily to the Knowledge of the real Doctrine of the Fathers, whose Writings from that time he vehemently urged against all opposers of the Truth. This shews us the strength of Prejudice, and how necessary it is for the Understanding of the Fathers, to become first well exercised in the Holy Scriptures.

AS to the *Centuriators* of *Magdebourg*, it is known they held the *Ausbourg* Confession, and taught the Doctrine of the *Real Presence*, and consequently are not competent Judges in this Controversy. For they have bin greatly concerned to have the Fathers on their side, some of them choosing rather to impose the Sense of *Transubstantiation* on the indefinite general Expressions, which import that the Bread is made the Body of Jesus Christ, or that it is changed into the Body of Jesus Christ, rather than to understand them in a mystical Sense, which would overthrow their Doctrine. Howsoever it be, they are not of the number of our Ministers, and Mr. Arnaud ought not to stray thus beyond the Bounds of this Controversy.

THAT Passage of *Scaligers* which he urgeth against us, is taken out of one of the most impertinent Books as ever was written, and Mr. Arnaud hath more Leisure than he pretends, seeing he sets himself upon inquiring after such kind of Proofs. This Book being a Collection of what *Scaliger* is pretended to have discoursed in a familiar Colloquy, which is stuffed with all manners of Fooleries, and Absurdities. For the School Boyes, from whose Memoirs these Exercitations were committed to the Press, have inserted whatsoever came into their Heads, after a childish and inconsiderate manner, which shews us they had not yet arrived to years of Discretion. Moreover Mr. Arnaud informs us himself that one of these Youths who helped to make this Rhapsody, turned Roman Catholick, which might well transport him by a Zeal common to young Converts, to make his Master speak a word

word or two in favour of *Transubstantiation*, Mr. *Arnaud* seems moreover to speak of Ministers, but it is known by every one that *Scaliger* was none.

*WITEMBOGARD* was one of the chief of the *Arminian* Party, interested against the *French* Ministers, neither is he a Witness to be fully believed in what he tells us concerning *Casanbon*; yet if what *Spondanus* has written of *Casanbon*, be true, we must acknowledge that this Person, who altho otherwise was extraordinarily learned, did not excel in Judgment. He was a man, saith he, of a fickle Mind, and ever wavering in matters of Religion, he was willing to please both Parties, and by that means pleased neither. It is very likely that near Familiarity he had with *Cardinal Perron*,  
*Anrâl. Eccl. ad An. 1600, art. 12.* drew him into this ambiguous Humour, which ought not to be made use of against us, much less to be proposed as an Example for the regulating of our Conduct. And besides he may more justly be said to be Critick than a Minister.

I shall not here trouble my self with what is alleaged concerning *Socinus* and his Followers; for there is a great deal of Passion and Injustice shewed, in Confronting them with us, seeing the Point here in Question is what our most knowing Ministers hold about this matter; I confess the *Socinians* reject *Transubstantiation* and the *Real Presence*, but it is moreover so much their interest to decry the Doctrine of the *Fathers*, that 'tis no marvel if they speak so unjustly of them. They have built on the antient Heresies of *Photinus*, *Macedonius*, and *Pelagius*, and seeing themselves opposed by Councils, and by the writings of the *Fathers*, this hath moved them not only to have no respect for them; but likewise to lay to their charge things which they never believed; to the end they might render them odious, and mar their Credit. So that Mr. *Arnaud*, imposes on us (when he tells us) that the *Socinians* have no interest in acknowledging that the Writings of the *Fathers* favour the *Catholicks*, and that it would have bin more to their Advantage to deny this. The contrary of which is apparent.  
*Lib. 1. C. 5. Pag. 41.*

WHEN he should produce some of our Ministers who doubted whether the Writings of the *Fathers* favour us in the point of the *Eucharist*, or who even believed they were against us, should this appear so strange to us? It is not an easy matter for a man to disentangle himself out of all the corrupt passages which are falsely attributed to the *Fathers*, and set forth under their Names, and from all the Artifices made use of to disguise their Doctrines. I have written a Chapter on purpose in my Answer to *Father Noüet*, wherein I produce several Examples of this, which the Readers may peruse at their Leisure. Even *Casanbon* himself whom I now mentioned, is one of them who hath fallen into this Snare, for he hath taken two preparatory Prayers for the Mass, to be the true and undoubted Works of *St. Ambrose*, altho that in effect, they are composed by *Anselme* Bishop of *Canterbury*. Now if any Person has bin deceived like *Casanbon*, and doubted whether the *Fathers* were for us, must this be used as a Proof against us, ought such a ones Mistakes to be the Rule of our Thoughts, this certainly is contrary to reason.

BUT for one Minister or two whom Mr. *Arnaud* can bring against us, we can produce a great number who have not hesitated in this matter. *Calvin* himself, who lived in a time when these Fopperies were scarcely discovered, yet asserts that the *Fathers* have retained the pious and orthodox Sense  
of



Inst. Lib. 4.  
C. 18.

of this Mystery, and affirms, that not having found them at all to derogate from the only Sacrifice of Jesus Christ, he could not therefore consent to the charging of them with Impiety, altho he doth not think them wholly excusable in the form of the *Aktion*. To Calvin we may add Cook (who was Tutor to King Edward of England, and supposed to be Author of a Book intitled *Di-allacticon*;) Thomas Crammer Arch-Bishop of Canterbury; Bp. Jewel, Peter Martyr; the Author of the Orthodox Treatise; Andrew Volan, the Divines of the University of Heydelberg; Du Moulin, Chamier, Rivet, Faucheur, Mestresat, and Blondel; not to mention Du Plessis, and Mr. De Sanmaise, nor several others who have written on this Subject, by the Testimony of the *Fathers*; which sheweth with how great precipitation Mr. Arnaud hath asserted: that it is most false, the most knowing Ministers are perswaded the *Fathers* are manifestly for them, and the Solutions they give their Passages are good and Solid.

WHAT he mentions concerning Mr. Daillé, is taken in a contrary Sence; for he never designed to deny the Advantage we have in the *Fathers* touching the *Eucharist*, nor leave it to be questioned. His Book against Mr. Adam, and Cottiby is an authentick Proof of this, and being as yet thro Gods Grace, in a Capacity to declare his own Thoughts, there needs no more but to ask his opinion touching this Point, and see what Answer he will make. There will appear no Difference betwixt his Opinion and mine, provided his Words are understood as he meant them.

De usu Pat.  
C. 2

Mr. Daillé saies, 'tis a hard matter to gather from the Writings of the *Fathers*, their Opinions touching those Articles in Religion, about which we differ, because the matters they treat of are for the most part very remote. His meaning is that it is a hard matter to find a formal and expresse Declaration of their Sence in these matters; which should be declared in such Terms as these, *I deny, or affirm, I approve, or condemn, I reject, or receive*; and the Reason he alleges do's sufficiently confirm this: for he saies, *That the Matters they treat of are remote from our Controversies, and that they thought not of us when they wrote.*

Ibid.

MY Sence differs not from his, and therefore I shall not fear to say with him, that they that expect to find the Belief of the *Fathers* clearly set down in their Writings, are generally mistaken, even as he who thinks to meet with the Affections and Desires of his Mind amongst the sound of Bells. And indeed, if we expect to find a positive and precise Rejection of the *Romish* Doctrine in the Writings of the *Fathers*, like unto that which is at this day amongst us, we shall be much mistaken, and the Reason is apparent, in as much as the Doctrine of the Church of Rome being not extant in the time of the *Fathers*, they have not expressly condemned it, for men are not wont to condemn Opinions before they appear. Yet do's not this hinder but that the *Fathers* are against *Transubstantiation*, by way of Negation, that is to say by their Silence, because they never inserted it amongst the Articles of their Faith, they never propounded it to their Hearers, nor unfolded the Mysteries of it, nor defended its Consequences, as doth the Church of Rome, as they had without question done, had they believed it. And this is what I say; and Mr. Daillé dos not gainsay it; but on the contrary a few lines after what Mr. Arnaud has recited, he lays down this general Proposition: *That the silence of the Fathers on the controverted Points which they so much value, is of some weight, and amounts perhaps to a clear Proof; but surely not in favour of them*  
who

Ibid.

who hold the Affirmative. So far Mr. Daillé and I speak precisely the same language. But I affirm likewise, that besides the silence of the *Fathers* there is to be found several things in their Writings; inconsistent with the Belief of *Transubstantiation*, and the *Real Presence*, and I hold this Proof doth evidently conclude they did not believe these Doctrines; Mr. Daillé speaking in general of this Order of Proofs, saith, he freely confesseth that every wise mans Faith is as a Body, whose parts have a dependance on each other. So that we may know by the things he expresseth, what he thinks of those which he expresseth not, whether he doth believe them or not, it being unlikely he would admit what doth evidently oppose his Opinions, or reject their necessary Consequences, to which he addeth, that he does acknowledg that this way of handling the Writings of the *Fathers* would be most profitable, and more proper to dive into their bottom, than any other, provided we suppose two things, the one, that the Belief of the antient Doctōrs is all of a Piece, and does no way contradict it self, and the other, that he who would judge after this manner, must have a piercing Wit, a good Memory, and a Judgment free from Prejudice. Ibid.

AS to the first of these Suppositions, he saith, that it is not absolutely out of doubt; and as to the other, that all these Qualities do seldom meet in one man. What he saies is true, in this general Consideration. But this does not hinder me from adding, that in the particular case of *Transubstantiation*, and the *Real Presence*, the first supposition is out of doubt; and the second is not absolutely necessary. To make this apparent, we need but consider, on one hand the rank these Doctrines hold in a Church which believes them, and on the other, the number and nature of those things which oppose them in the Writings of the antient *Fathers*. The Example of the Church of *Rome* shews us, that they that believe them, respect them as inviolable Mysteries which must not be called in question, and such as are of greatest Importance in Religion, and which must be defended against the Contradiction of Sense and Reason, and for which we ought to be armed with the greatest Caution; as being in short, Mysteries which are daily represented us, in their Celebration and Participation of them, which should be distinctly known by all the Faithful, and cleerly and plainly taught the People, to the end every one may know that what he receiveth is the proper Substance of his Saviour, and give him the Worship due to a Creator. Whence it follows, that if the antient Church believed these things, it has believed them in this Degree, and that 'tis not possible but the *Fathers* in general would take such care as not to maintain things which overthrow them, or reject others which are the necessary Consequences of them. It is not possible I say, that they should all of 'em be thus inconsiderate as to assert several things which may justly scandalize their Followers and that in so ticklish and well known a Point, as is that of the Substance of Jesus Christ, which they every day received. On the other hand, if we consider the Nature and Number of things to be met with in the Writings of the *Fathers*, contrary to *Transubstantiation* and the *Real Presence*, we shall observe they are contrary to them by a primary, immediate and evident contrariety, for which there is no need of a sharp Wit, nor great Memory, but a sound understanding, and disinterested Judgment: we shall find that these things are in great Number, and as well prevail over a mans Mind by their Multitude, as their Quality. And this Mr. Daillé has not denied, so that as I do not thwart his Rule, so he does not oppose my Exception, therefore there is no Contradiction betwixt us.

C. 1.

BUT Mr. Arnaud will reply, Mr. Daillé do's oppose our Exception, for he applies his Rule to the Subject of the *Eucharist*, acknowledging that as there are Passages in the Fathers Writings, which seem to be inexplicable, in the Church of Romes Sence, so there are likewise some which can in no wise admit the Sence of the Protestants, as them which expressly import that the Bread changes its Nature, that by the Almighty Power of God it becometh the Flesh of the Word: and such like. If Cardinal Perron, saith he, and other sublime Wits on both sides, protest they find no Difficulty, we must acknowledge they said it only out of a Bravadoe, turning the best side outwards, or else that the rest of the World are very dim sighted to perceive nothing but Darkness, where these People behold nothing but Light. And elsewhere, taking notice of some Passages (which seem to deny the Constubstantiality of the Son, determined in the Council of Nice,) which are to be met with in the Writings of the Fathers who preceded that Council. Let the Fathers, addeth he, affirm or deny that the *Eucharist* is really the Body of Christ, they will not for all this contradict thy Opinion, whosoever thou art, whether Romanist or Protestant, more strongly than the Fathers of Antioch did in appearance contradict them of Nice. To which we may now add, that as the Arians had no reason to dray to their Opinion, and alleage, as decisive parts of their Question, such transient Discourses as were innocently meant by the antient Fathers, without any Design of treating on this: so likewise we have no cause, neither thou I say nor I, to alleage as Sentences pronounced in our case, which has bin stated but of late, the sayings of the Fathers, which were written by them on other matters, several Ages before our Controversies began, concerning which they have expressed themselves very differently and obscurely, and even sometimes in appearance contradictorily. Having shewn afterwards that the Fathers designed to be obscure in their Discourses concerning the *Eucharist*, to hide this Mytery from the Catecumenists.

SEEING then, saith he, that in this and other Matters, they designed to conceal their Thoughts, we must not therefore wonder, if their Expressions have bin oftentimes obscure, and that which commonly is an effect of Obscurity, if they seem sometime to differ and contradict one another.

Answer to  
the Perpetuity  
P. 192.

Answer to  
the Perpetuity  
P. 34.

I answer that this being well understood, doth not at all obstruct my Exception, nor what I said in my Answer to the *Perpetuity*. Mr. Daillé speaks of the particular Judgment which we may make of some Passages of the Fathers produced by both Parties; and I speak of the general Judgment which ought to be made on the whole Body of our Proofs, and Difficulties brought against them; and as to what Mr. Arnaud alleageth concerning my Answer, wherein I speak touching the Sence which People Assisted by the light of Scripture, strength of Reason, and plain Instructions of their Ministers, may give to the mystical Expressions, which were then in use. These are things wholly different. I do not deny but that there are several difficult Places in the Writings of the Fathers. Some of which Mr. Daillé has taken Notice of. He needed not be brought in question for this, seeing I plainly delivered my Mind touching this matter, in the beginning of my Answer. I affirm that the way of seeking the Truth touching the *Eucharist*, by the Doctrine of the Fathers, is in it self a way which is indirect, preposterous, and very tedious, wherein we have great cause to fear Mistakes and Wandrings. These are my Words, and Mr. Daillé has said no more, and I do still affirm, that if a man examines these Passages apart, and protests he finds no obscurity in them, we cannot but take these his Protections for Bravadoes. But this does not hinder but



but that the general Judgment we ought to make of the Belief of the *Fathers* touching the *Eucharist*, and which resulteth from an exact consideration of the Proofs relating both to one side and the other, is undoubtedly on our side, whether these particular Passages, which seem at first to be difficult, are illustrated by others which shew the real Sence of them, or when their Difficulty should remain, it is overcome by the Number and Evidence of the contrary Proofs. The Considerations which Mr. *Daille* makes on these difficult Places, do in themselves contribute to the Establishment of the certitude of this general Judgment, which I mentioned: for they discover to us the Causes of this Obscurity, they give us the like Examples in other Matters, and by this means lessen the Offence which may be taken at them, and satisfy a mans Mind.

BUT he saith, *that neither the Romanists, nor the Protestants have any reason to allege as Sentences pronounced on our Differences which arose but of late, the Discourses of the antient Fathers, written by them upon other matters, several years before.* What he saith is true, for we should be to blame, should we take them for declaratory Sentences. But this hinders not but we may still conclude, they held not *Transubstantiation*, and the *Real Presence*, because that if they had held these Doctrines, they would not have expressed themselves as they do. Neither doth this deprive us of the Liberty of proceeding by way of Negation, which is to conclude by their Silence in these Doctrines, that they held them not. Neither does this moreover hinder, but that after a due Consideration of all these affirmative and negative Proofs, we may make a certain and decisive Judgment on the Question touching the Doctrine of the antient Church in our own Favour. So that Mr. *Arnaud* has spent his time to no purpose, when he undertook to shew this pretended Contrariety, which he affirms to be between Mr. *Daille* and me.

But Mr. *Daille's* Design, saith he, is to shew in general, that we must not take the Fathers for Judges of Controversies, and especially in that of the *Eucharist*. I acknowledge it, because these Difficulties he mentions, do shew this way is long and troublesom; and that we meet in it such Entanglements as are hardly to be surmounted, and therefore this is not a proper means for all sorts of Persons, but only for those that have time and all other necessary helps. This I do not deny, but on the contrary do ever affirm, that the holy Scripture is the only certain Rule, and our having recourse to the *Fathers* is but by way of Condescension. I say farther that if they to whom this way does properly belong, would proceed in it with that Sincerity and Diligence which is necessary, they would easily be able by the Guidance of common Sense, to make this Evident and certain Judgment; That the antient Church believed not what the Church of *Rome* does at this present: and this Mr. *Daille* will acknowledge as well as I.

Lib. 3. C. 5.  
P. 47.

IF I have insisted too long on this Subject 'tis because I believed I ought to reprehend Mr. *Arnaud* for his Injustice towards two Persons whom he would fain set at Variance, by making of them contradict one another. But return we to the rest of our Observations.

## CHAP. VI.

*A farther Examination of the pretended Advantages which Mr. Arnaud attributes to the Treatise of the Perpetuity.*

Lib. I. C. 5.  
P. 47.

THE Subject of my fourth Observation is taken from what Mr. Arnaud assures us, viz. that all that are of Mr. Daillé's Mind (that is to say, who are perswaded they must not decide the Question touching the Eucharist, by the Writings of the Fathers, (seeing they are so obscure and intricate, that it is a hard matter to make them agree,) cannot refuse to render themselves up to the Proofs of the Perpetuity, in case they judge them evident; whence he concludes that all-knowing Persons who are sincere, on the one hand, and on the other, all they who cannot judge by themselves, will acquiesce in these Proofs. This Pretension is as ill grounded as the former. For there being, as I already said, two Questions before us, the one, touching what we are to believe concerning the Eucharist, and the other concerning what has bin believed by the antient Church, the first of these, which is that of *Right*, respects in general all them of our Communion; but the second, for as much as it may be decided by History, only respects them amongst us, who have sufficient Leasure and Curiosity to inform themselves. So that the Prolixity, Difficulty, and intricacy which we meet with in the Writings of the *Fathers*, do sufficiently evidence that their Books are very improper for the Decision of the first of these Questions, whereon depends that of our Controversies, seeing these Difficulties will be insuperable to the greatest part amongst us; altho they will not render them unfit to decide the second, because they are not insuperable to them who would apply themselves thereunto as they ought, to satisfy their Curiosity, neither will they hinder them in short from making a most certain Judgment in our Favour. If then the Treatise of the *Perpetuity* be only offered to them to whom the first Question belongs, they will answer they have no need of it, being satisfied with the Word of God; and if they be demanded what they believe touching the antient Church, they will answer, that they judge of it according to the Rules of Christian Charity, and our Saviours Promises. But if we proceed farther, and suppose it be enquired of them, how it has come to pass that the Church of *Rome* has altered the antient Doctrine; they will answer, their Salvation depends not on this Knowledge, but that it must needs be, it has made an Alteration; seeing it believes at this day what it ought not to believe, and which without doubt hath not bin believed heretofore, as they judge out of Charity to the Antients. Should they be urged to tell how this has hapned, they will answer again, this is not an account wherein their Salvation is concerned, and that this Question ought to be proposed to those Persons who know it, and in all this they will have Reason. If this Treatise be offered to those of the second Rank, that is to say to them who are learned, and have had the Curiosity of informing themselves, and to whom properly the second Question belongs; they will likewise answer, they have no need of this Method, having already informed themselves by a natural and direct way, which is of more value than all these Conjectures, or if they have not done it, they will do it, being not so silly

as to shut their Eyes, and reject the Evidence of their Senses, to betake themselves to a Method wherein there can be nothing but Confusion to be expected, and these last will have Reason too.

BUT saith Mr. *Arnaud*, we must suppose that the Proofs of the Treatise are evident, for they cannot be supposed false, till such time as they are examined. You ought then to have begun here, wherefore your Exceptions signify nothing. I answer that these Suppositions are not juster than his Arguments. For if these curious Persons whom I mentioned, have already taken the Pains they ought, whereby to ascertain themselves in the Proofs of Fact, they will be prepared to judge, that the Arguments of the Treatise are false and captious, because that moral Impossibilities, such as these are, and in such a Subject as this, cannot subsist against Proofs of Fact, which are immediate, certain, and evident as ours are. If they have not yet taken this Pains, I say that without examining whether the Proofs of the Treatise be good or bad, they will only mind the Method, and by comparing it with that of Discussion, if they are men of Reason, they will prefer this last before the other, because that 'tis in effect most natural in it self, and more certain in its Proofs.

WHAT shall we do then with the Treatise of the *Perpetuity*, which has made such a Noise in the World? Will it be of no use? There are a crew of People in the World, who are curious and idle both together, who are willing to know the Opinions of former Ages on these famous Articles, about which *Europe* is at this day divided; but yet will be at no Pains for this, because Labour is distasteful to them, and they have other things to do. It is then for such Persons as these, this Treatise has bin written. For it courteth them, and presents it self to 'em, whether at Ease or in Business; it only desires them to spend two Hours on its Reading, whereby to decide a Point of this Importance. The Style of it is curious and enticing, and its Expressions emphatical, it winneth on the Mind, and leads it insensibly where it pleases. All this flatters mens Curiosity and Lazyness both together. But if this sort of People loved their Salvation, as we may suppose they ought, we should then have but two or three things to say to them. First, that they beware of these short Methods, which favour at the same time two Inclinations, which seldom agree, I mean Idleness and Curiosity. For we cannot arrive at any certainty in these kind of Questions, if we do not earnestly apply our selves to them, for Labour and Knowledge do always go together, and it commonly happens that they who thus promise us such great Knowledge, without any trouble, do cheat us two ways, for they lead us into tedious Prolixities, and dreadful Difficulties, and at last having tired us, they leave us as wise as we were at first.

AND this is exactly the case of the Treatise of the *Perpetuity*, if we rightly consider it; for it promises us immediately, nothing but Perspicuity, Facilities, and Convictions, it being made up of undeniable Truths. Yet let a man take but the Pains to examine only his first Point, which is his first Supposition, on which the whole stress of his Book lies; and he will find that 'tis impossible to be certain in it. I mean the Year one thousand fifty three, wherein *Berengarius* was at first condemned, and in which time the Author of the Treatise pretend's the universal Church was agreed in the Belief of *Transubstantiation* and the *real Presence*. Now to be satisfied in this particular, we should have an exact Knowledge of the eleventh Century, to the  
end



end we may discern whether this Condemnation of *Berengarius* was the real Effect of the Churches Union, or only that of a Party, which was then the strongest at the Court of *Rome*. We should know each particular matter of this great Affair, that we may be able to judge whether humane Interest had no share in it: whether those that were concerned in it did not act against their Consciences; and whether the Proceedings were just and regular. We must examine the State of Princes, Ecclesiasticks, and People, to be satisfied in this supposed Union. We should have before us the Writings of *Berengarius* and others who held the same Opinions, to understand their Arguments and Defences. But all these things are impossible. We have no other account of this History, than what some interested Writers have bin pleased to give us, and in which there are Relations justly suspected to be false. The secret Designs and Motives which then prevailed are out of our reach. We know scarcely any thing more of the Persons who then made up the Church, but that they were the greatest part of them buried in profound Ignorance. The Writings of *Berengarius* and his Followers are lost, for there has bin Care taken to extinguish the Remembrance of them. In short, this is an Abyss wherein we behold nothing, whereby we may be able to affirm with any certainty, that the whole Church was united in the Belief of *Transubstantiation* and the *real Presence*. For a man to give Credit to any Relation of *Berengarius's* Adversaries; (who bragged that their Opinion was that of the whole World,) it would be to be over Credulous, in any Affair of this Importance, and so much the more, because the contrary appeareth by substantial Proofs, which should be examined, before we rest satisfied in them.

SO that here we are already sufficiently perplexed in the first Particular, and shall be no less in the others. If we would be ascertained in the Proofs of the Treatise, we should know perfectly the Tempers of the People, their Condition and principal Circumstances, in the Ages which preceded the eleventh Century. We should know, how the Body of the Ecclesiasticks was composed, what was the Humour and Temper of them who held the first Rank, even how far their Credit and Authority reached, what kind of Instructions they gave the People, and after what manner the People received them. We must likewise examine the nature of the Change we speak of, by what degrees we suppose it has bin introduced, by how many ways and means it may be said to be possible. For if all this be not distinctly known, how can it with any Confidence be affirmed, that this Change is impossible. Moreover before it can be affirmed as an undoubted Truth, that had an Innovation touching the *Eucharist* bin attempted, the People would have risen into Tumults, the *Religious* clamour'd against it, the Ecclesiasticks opposed it, and the Councils taken notice of it, and in short the Bands of an external Communion would have bin broken; how many particulars must be cleared up first! We ought to know what kind of Zeal People had for the Glory of God in those Days; whether the effects of this Zeal could not be hindered by I know not how many things which occur in these different Orders of men, whom I mentioned, as Ignorance in some, simplicity and meanness of Spirit in others, the fear of disturbing the publick Peace, the Favour or Hatred of Persons, and several other humane Causes, which set men on acting or desisting from it. We should likewise have a true and particular Account of the Condition of the schismatical Churches at that time, when *Berengarius* was condemned, which is not an easy matter, as will appear in the sequel of this Discourse. In a Word, to attain the ends of the Design

of

of this Treatise, when even its Proofs should be Substantial and Conclusive, a man must be more knowing than an Angel; for unless we knew the Thoughts of all mankind, for the space of two hundred Years together, or could raise the Dead to inform our selves by them of what they have done; and what they have not done, it is not otherwise possible to be at any certainty. But it will be perhaps answered, we must judge according to the Light of common Sense, and what we see in our times; to which I reply, that even common Sense shewes us, that there is no certainty in these kind of Proofs, and that the Experience of our own Age contradicts them. And when it should be imagined that all these Difficulties are surmounted, I come then and trouble this Victory with my *Aubertin*, and Proofs of Fact, requiring, before the Question be decided, that my Objection be answered. Now should Mr. *Arnaud* pretend my Objection is groundless, and that I should be silenced in being told, that these Proofs have bin considered, and their pretended Clearness appears only to them, who suffer themselves to be transported by the *Enthusiasms* of my *Rhetorick*, I shall make him answer, that I speak here only of curious and lazy People, to whom the Treatise of the *Perpetuity* is offered as a short Method, to ease them of the lengths of a way of Discussion: which sort of Persons cannot say they know all our Proofs.

I shall tell him moreover, that the reading of my Book, has not yet so far transported People with Enthusiastical Raptures, as the reading of his has done to his immortal Praise. For there are Latin Verses under this very Title of *Enthusiasms*, which Mr. *Arnauds* Friends its seems have not bin ashamed to print, in which there appears all the lively Characters of a Poetical Fury. For they speak of his Book, as of the *Sun*, which contains in it self a great measure of the Divine Light: His Lines are called *new Darts of the Sacred Cupid*; and his whole Book is said to be full of God. *Puro Numine, mi Libelle, Plenus*. It is compared to our Saviour himself, when he came down from Heaven; and is said to have done the same Miracles; there is one of its Readers introduced, who being filled with its Divinity, cries out, *Numen ecce Numen, ibi Numen*. Mr. *Arnaud* is termed, *Vir sacro & numinis entheatus astro*, and his Wit, *Mentis vigor entheus*, and again he is set forth to us as an *Hercules* armed with Cœlestial Weapons, trampling all things under his Feet, conquering the Conquerours themselves, and triumphing over the Triumphers. In short, *France* is congratulated upon the Glory it receives. *Tanto prodigio superba fulge, felix prodigio futura tanto*. All which considered, has not Mr. *Arnaud* pertinently mentioned Enthusiasms? Certainly never the Tripos of *Delphos*, nor the Grove of the Sibyl *Cumee*, inspired such like Ravings.

BUT to return to the matter in hand. Is it not possible will some say, to be ascertained of the matter in Question, by some way less tedious and intricate, than the examination of such a great Volum as Mr. *Aubertin's* Book? Yea without doubt; for, to know as much as is necessary, to the satisfying of a mans Mind, he need but judge according to the instincts of Charity, and the Confidence he ought to have in our Saviours Promises. Now if a man keeps to these Principles, he will draw a Conclusion as satisfactory as can be desired. The Promises of our Saviour assure us that his Spirit shall be with the Faithful to the end of the World; and Christian Charity obliges us to believe that the *Fathers* are of this Number. From whence I conclude, that there has ever bin a considerable number of true Christians, whose Faith

has not bin corrupted by damnable Errors. This is a sure Conclusion, and sufficient to satisfy my Mind. I conclude likewise, that the *Fathers* have bin of this Number, this is a Judgment of Charity, and is sufficient to acquit me of my Duty. Should it be told me, if I proceed farther, it would be to give my self a great deal of Trouble, *viz.* to Read, Study, and Meditate, to compare the Proofs of both Parties, and if this offends me, I can complain of no body but my self, that is to say of my own Lazyness or Curiosity.

IT is then neither just nor necessary to require any other abridged Methods, than those which I now observed. Yet it must not be thought but that there may be such offered, it being no difficult matter. For 'tis but looking from the Body of the Dispute, one of those captious Arguments, which seem to decide the whole Controversy by the Decision of one only Point. Which the Author of the *Perpetuity* has done, for he has singled out *Belarmins* Argument of the Impossibility of a Change, and proposed it with greater Enlargments, tho with less Force than he, and this is all the Mystery of this great Method of Prescription. So that this is not such a famous Undertaking; seeing every little Sophister could do as much. Take the Argument of the silence of the *Fathers* on *Transubstantiation* and the real Presence; insist largely thereon, write a Treatise on it; and here's then an abridged Method. Take the Argument of the certainty of our Senses; shew that the *Fathers* supposed it as an inviolable Principle of the Christian Religion; shew the Absurdities which would follow, had they believed that what we see in the Sacrament is not real Bread; here is then another Method of Prescription. Take likewise if you will, the Argument of the Silence of the Heathens, and accommodate it to the Treatise of the *Perpetuity*; and you will make another Method. It is the same with the Argument of the Accidents without a Subject, in respect of *Transubstantiation*; and of that of the Adoration of the Sacrament; and almost of all others.

TO speak my Sence of these Arguments reduced into Methods, I think they must be considered either absolutely, or in relation to some Circumstances. If we consider them absolutely; we must not reject them, for this only Reason that they are called Methods of Prescription. A rational Man will accept of them in a Controversy, as Arguments, he will weigh their Force; but whatsoever Strength they may have, he will not form his Judgment by them alone, because perhaps there may be on the other side things more considerable. What is there, for Example, of greater Force than the Argument taken from the Silence of the *Fathers*, touching the Existence of Accidents without a Subject? Yet is it certain that this Argument alone must not determine a Man; for should it be demonstrated that the *Fathers* expressly taught the Adoration of the Sacrament, and Conversion of the Substance, with all the other Consequences of *Transubstantiation*, excepting this Existence of the Accidents without a Subject, our Argument would not be strong enough to invalidate these contrary Proofs. They must then be ranked in the order of the Controversy, to the end they may be considered in a decisive Judgment.

THERE is not, to speak properly, but one particular case wherein we ought to be determined by a Method of Prescription, which is when God does or does not declare his Will in Points of Religion; for what is there in the World that can excel, or equal the Validity of his Testimony or Silence. In matters of Religion, 'tis the Word of God which determines us to believe



lieve positively such and such Points, and 'tis its Silence which determines us to reject others. Our Faith imitates the Wise Men of the *East*, it follows the Star that conducts it, (which is the Heavenly Revelation) and stops where this Star settleth, as knowing 'twould be to wander, to go farther. This then is the only true Method of Prescription in Questions of this Nature.

BUT supposing the Argument was taken from the Evidence of all the Senses, and in the Circumstances which make this Testimony Valid and Infallible, may we not determine our selves, without proceeding any farther? I answer that to speak absolutely, the Senses may be deceived, even with all the Circumstances which render their Testimony allowable, for the Devil may impose upon them by his Illusions; yet because a judicious man must judge of things, not out of regard to these extraordinary and rare Cases, but according to rule and common use, it is certain, that such an Argument must decide the Question of Fact.

THE same may be required touching those Arguments which are called in Philosophy, by the name of Demonstrations. If a Method was grounded on a Proof of this Force, would it not wholly decide the Question? I answer there are few Demonstrations, so evident and certain, that nothing can be opposed against them. Yet were there one offered which convinced the Mind, by an immediate and uncontrollable Evidence, (as those which manifest an apparent Contradiction, and a formal Incompatibility in the Terms; or those which are established on a necessary and inviolable Dependence, and which cannot be hind'ed, or which suppose one only Cause, without which 'tis not possible that a thing should exist; or lastly, such as are grounded on an indissoluble connexion of two Subjects which cannot be one without the other; ) I confess we ought then to yield; as when 'tis said, the Sun is risen, it is then day, or it is day, the Sun then is risen; there is a Son, there must then be a Father; I say, we cannot but acquiesce in these kind of Arguments. But because in things about which we dispute, these sort of primary and immediate Demonstrations are very rare, a judicious Person will not suffer himself to be surprized with every thing which bears the Name of Demonstration, or that has the Colour and appearance of it, and especially when it relates to a matter belonging to another Light than that of Reason, as are the Objects of Sense, and those of Faith: he must then suspend his Judgment, and reduce his pretended Demonstrations into the Order of the Dispute, to be compared with the contrary Proofs, to the end he may make a right Judgment.

AND this is what may be said in general of these abridged Methods. In their Circumstances, they are to be considered, either as relating to the Persons they are offered, or to the Question which they decide, or the Rank which they hold, and according to the quality of their Proofs. If they be offered to Persons to whom the Question doth not belong, it is in their Power absolutely to reject them, in alleging, that this concerns not them, and they cannot justly be blamed when they should do thus. Should they be offered to Persons interested in the Question, or who would take part in it, they ought ordinarily to proceed according to the Rules I have laid down, and especially if the Question which they decide is of that importance, as that it ought not to be slightly handled. But if we do suppose on one hand, that the Order of these Methods is indirect and unnatural, and that their Ar-

guments are not taken but from Probabilities, and on the other, that we may be informed by a more natural Course, and a more certain and infallible Means. I say, that a wise Man ought to prefer this last way before the other, altho it be more tedious and difficult, for tho he cannot answer these Arguments, yet this does not argue he must be determined by them; for it will be time enough to consider them, when after a due Examination of every thing that may be alleaged on both sides, he shall make his decisive Judgment. In fine, I say, that if we suppose a man already ascertained in the Question, by an orderly way, by numerous and conclusive Proofs, and by a Knowledge humanely Certain, and Infallible, as is that of his Eyes and common Senses on their proper Objects, he cannot reasonably be desired to change his Opinion by an indirect Method, which is from hence suspected to be artificial and deceitful, in that the Proofs which it offers can amount to no more than Probabilities. If he be wise, he will keep to his first Conclusion, and reject this Method as useless, without troubling himself with a particular Examination of it, unless to give himself the greater Satisfaction, he determines to discover the falsity of it.

WE see already what use must be made of the Treatise of the *Perpetuity*, together with all its long train of Arguments and Suppositions, which Mr. *Arnaud* has made in its Favour. For first, there is little Sincerity in the Objection he stated in the beginning, in which he doth not explain our real Pretension. Secondly, He passeth over in Silence, amongst the Number which he makes of the Persons of our Communion, several who trouble not themselves with the Dispute touching the Question of matter of Fact, that is to say touching the Belief of the antient Church, and in relation to these, who are the greatest number, we may already affirm that the Treatise of the *Perpetuity* is of no use. Thirdly, He has very ill proved that the most knowing Ministers do doubt whether the *Fathers* are for us, whence it follows, that not being able to finde his Profelytes, neither amongst the Rank of the Illiterate People, nor amongst that of the Learned, it is to be feared he will find them no where. Fourthly, He hath bin shewed, that when it should be granted, there were Ministers, who doubted whether the *Fathers* were for us; yet would it not follow, that they would leave the Word of God, on which alone their Faith depends, to yield themselves up to the Arguments of the *Perpetuity*. Fifthly, He hath bin shewed that when one or two should be of this Opinion, yet could they not carry it away from all the rest who have bin, or are of a contrary Mind: whence it follows, that if the least judicious among us regulate their Opinions on this Point by that of the most knowing, they will 'tis probable range themselves on the side of the greatest Number, rather than on that wherein there is but one or two; so that here is almost all of 'em escaped the *Treatise's* Conquest. Sixthly, It has bin likewise shewed him that the Prolixity and Difficulties to be expected in the common way, which is that of *Discussion*, yield no advantage to the *Treatise* to make it received under the Title of an abridged Method. Seventhly, He has bin moreover shewed the insuperable Perplexities wherein this Method engages People: So that those who are most in Love with short Ways, and new Fashions, cannot but be disgusted at this. Eighthly, It has bin demonstrated, that Persons who were never informed of the real Doctrine of the *Fathers*, and would willingly be ascertain'd of it, ought in all Reason to prefer a Method of *Discussion*, whatsoever tediousness and difficulty there may be in it, before that of the *Perpetuity*. We have likewise manifested that the Proofs of his Method, have not that just and due extent

tent, necessary to the forming of a judicious man's Mind: and which ours have. Tenthly, and lastly, It has bin proved to him that discreet Persons, who know our Proofs of Fact, and have examined them, may justly reject this Treatise as useless.

WHAT he then saies concerning these two contrary Evidences that hold the Mind in suspense between our Proofs of Fact, on one hand, and the Arguments of the *Perpetuity* on the other, is a meer Fancy. For this Unresolvedness is impossible in a man of Judgment. And Mr. *Arnaud* does not ground it but only on a Supposition, which he has no right to make, *That the Proofs of the Treatise intimate the impossibility of a Change, to that degree of Evidence, as will convince the Mind as much as the contrary Evidence.* Which I deny him, and that with good Reason, when I compare his Proofs with ours. His Proofs are grounded on a Supposition, in which it is impossible to be ascertain'd, they are of the kind of moral Impossibilities, which never carry in them a Certitude beyond Exception, and moreover, the Subject or Matter they handle, makes them still a thousand times more uncertain and doubtful; for what is more uncertain than that which depended on Peoples Inclinations, who lived seven or eight hundred Years ago, and on the Conjunction of a thousand things, of which we scarcely know one. We need but consider these Proofs in this respect, to declare them uncertain; But to demonstrate the falsity of them, we must compare them with ours, against which there can no general Objections be made, seeing they are numerous, and thoroughly handle the Question, and which taken severally, have all possible Strength and Evidence.

TO find out distinctly and clearly the knot of this whole Controversy, and judge of it with less Trouble and more Solidity, it needs only be considered that Mr. *Arnaud* and I do make almost the same Suppositions, and draw the same Consequences, but each of us in his own Favour. He supposes my Proofs of Fact are uncertain, and I do not only suppose they of his Treatise are so, but that they are moreover False. He supposeth that they of the Treatise are Evident. I suppose that mine are so. He concludes mine are to be Rejected, and them of the Treatise Embraced. I conclude that they of the Treatise are to be Rejected, and mine Entertained. For to judge aright so far, it needs only be considered which of us two has most reason to make these Suppositions, and settles them on surest Grounds; for he that does so, has the Consequence for him. Mr. *Arnaud* grounds his on the *Enthusiasms of my Rhetorick*, on some pretended Testimonies of the Learned, and his own Judgment on Mr. *Aubertin's* Book, and that of the *Perpetuity*. I build mine on the Right a Respondent has to suppose his Opinion in a Dispute. Whence I conclude, I may suppose my Proofs of Fact to be good and firm; I ground them on a general Comparifon I make of his Proofs with ours, and manifest that ours are according to a natural and direct Method, and his according to an indirect and forced one; That ours are sufficient to enable a man to make a sound and solid Judgment, and that his are not so, that ours are obvious to Sense, whereas his are but meer Conjectures. And 'tis upon this we ought to be judged. But we must proceed farther; for Mr. *Arnaud* goes so far as to suppose his Proofs and mine appear equally evident, and 'tis upon this that he grounds the whole Argument of his sixth Chapter. He would have that these two contrary Evidences forming a Suspension of Mind, a rational Man is thereby obliged to determine himself by the Advantages which appear moreover in the Church of *Rome*.



and here we begin to take two different ways, for I will not grant him the Evidence of his Treatise, as he grants me that of my Proofs. And in effect no man may make groundless Suppositions, which being impossible, cannot therefore be reasonable. Now it is not possible that a man who is perswaded of the Evidence of our Proofs, can find any Evidence in his, being such as they are, because they have a Defect in their kind, which makes them vanish before ours. 'Tis moreover on this we ought to be tried.

YET let us suppose, by way of Divertisement, these two contrary Evidences which hold us in Suspense, what follows thence? that we must be determined by the Authority of the Church of *Rome*. This indeed Mr. *Arnaud* saies: and I maintain we ought wholly to apply our selves to the Scriptures, and leave those Perplexities touching the Opinions of the *Fathers*, that we may ground our Faith only on the Word of God; and I pretend by this means we shall adhere to the reformed Church. What must we then do about this new Difference? Mr. *Arnaud* and I must Dispute concerning the Scripture and Church of *Rome*, to know which of us two has most reason. And these are the Effects of this admirable Method, the Glory of our time, and Quintessence of Humane Wit, which after several windings and turnings, several hot Debates and sharp Disputes, and after an Invitation of all *France*; and all them of either Communion to the beholding of this famous Contest, refers the matter at length to the Holy Scripture and the Church. And this is the fruit of the Treatise of the *Perpetuity*. And indeed if we continue to dispute after this manner, I think the World has little reason to concern it self in our Debate, seeing 'tis a vain amusement. We wrestle against one another with all our Might, we sweat, and take a great deal of Pains, and make our Books be bought dear: and after all we are to begin again. For if we must now dispute concerning the Holy Scripture and the Church, wherefore did we not do so in the beginning? Wherefore must the Treatise of the *Perpetuity* be for a Preludium to this? Is it because the Gate of this Controversy is not yet wide enough of it self, but that the Treatise of the *Perpetuity* must introduce us? Or is it not worthy our regard, and therefore the Treatise of the *Perpetuity* must be its Mediatour. Is it that either the Church of *Rome*, or the Scripture have need, (to the end they may be recommended to us,) the one of the Treatise of the *Perpetuity*, and the other of my Answer, and that no man can betake himself to either of these without our Guidance. For my part I pretend not to this, and therefore think it beside the Purpose to begin a new Controversy.

## CHAP. VII.

*The six last Chapters of Mr. Arnaud's Book Examined.*

**M**R. Arnaud's last six Chapters of his first Book being only as loose Pieces, which relate not to the Method of the *Perpetuity*, nor our Proofs of Fact; and the greatest part of them consisting in fruitless Digressions, which have no connexion with the Subject of the *Eucharist*: it seems thereupon he has intended them only as an enlargement to his Book, and as a means to tire his readers Patience. Which will oblige me to make only a succinct Answer, it being unreasonable to carry off the Debate to other Subjects, and charge my self with unnecessary matters: but howsoever concise my Answer may be, yet will it manifest the weakness and folly of all these tedious and troublesome Discourses of Mr. Arnaud.

HIS seventh Chapter respects an Objection I made against the Author of the *Perpetuity*, concerning the Infallibility he attributes to the People; which he grounds on this, that People naturally will not suffer their Opinions to be snatched from them, nor Novelties introduced in matters of Religion; for I had intimated that this would oppose the Infallibility which the Church of *Rome* attributes to the Popes and Councils. The remaining part of the first Book is spent in treating on some other Innovations, which we suppose to have insensibly crept in, as that in the Establishment of Episcopacy, praying for the Dead, the invocation of Saints, and prohibition of certain Meats. These are the things I intend to treat of in this Chapter. That I may proceed orderly, I shall first examine this pretended popular *Infallibility*, by comparing it with the Infallibility of Popes or Councils, for we must see whether I had not reason to make against the Author of the *Perpetuity* the Objection contained in my Preface. This Question will be soon ended, if it be considered that I have alleaged some Examples of the Insensible Alterations which actually hapned in the Church, in several Points, as well Practical as Speculative, and that the Author of the *Perpetuity* could not defend himself but by protesting. *That he has not offered in general this Maxim, that there could not happen in the Church any imperceptible Change, in the use of Ceremonies, or in Opinions which are no ways Popular, but Speculative, that he has bin cautious of proposing of it in this generality, and therefore has restrained it to capital Mysteries, which are known to all the Faithful, by a distinct Faith.* To answer after this manner, what is it but to confess a Change has hapned in Points, which are not popular. Which Confession absolutely overthrows the Infallibility claimed by the Church of *Rome*.

*Perpetuity of  
the Faith,  
Part 2. C. 7.*

IT is to no purpose that Mr. Arnaud distinguishes betwixt an *Infallibility of Grace or Privilege*, and a humane and popular *Infallibility*, and to assert that the Author of the *Perpetuity* doth in no wise pretend to disavow the *Infallibility of the Church and Councils*, as it respects all kind of *Mysteries*, whether Popular or others. For these Examples I produced, do equally op-

*Lib. 1. C. 7.*

pose

Perpetuity of  
the Faith.  
Part 2. C. 7.

pose all manner of Infallibility, and to acknowledg it in any kind, would be to let go this pretended *Infallibility of Priviledge*. I will suppose the Alterations I mentoned to have hapned in Points not Popular, yet are they Innovations nevertheless, and when they were not contrary to the natural Infallibility, yet would they be to that which is termed of Grace, seeing that they are actual Alterations in Points of Religion. Whence it follows, that a man who believes them to be true, cannot deny but that he acts contrary to the Principle of the Church of *Rome*, which is, that the Popes and Councils are only Infallible, and that Mr. *Arnauds* Distinction is a meer Illusion: for if the Church of *Rome* has admitted an Alteration in Points not Popular, she is not then Infallible in respect of these Points. 'Tis certain that the Author of the *Perpetuity* was minded to wrangle about some of the Examples I produced, pretending the Doctrine of Faith has not bin altered, altho the Practice of it has bin so; but he does not oppose what I alleaged touching the Doctrine of Grace, which is not a Point of Practice but Belief, contenting himself only with saying, *That the Truths of Divine Grace have never bin popular in all the Consequences which have bin drawn from them in Theology, and that 'tis false, they are not still the same in principal and essential Points.* But is not this still to acknowledg that in respect of Points not Popular, and which are neither principal, nor essential, in the matter of Grace, there has hap'ned a Change. Now these Points whatsoever they be, whether principal or not, great or small, are Doctrinal Points which cannot be altered, without passing over from Truth to Error, or from Error to Truth. If then it be true, as I have already said, and as the Author of the *Perpetuity* has not denyed, that the Church has bin several times of contrary Opinions, upon which account it is impossible, but she has bin in Error, and consequently she is not Infallible in this Infallibility of Grace, and Priviledg attributed unto her. The Author of the *Perpetuity's* Answer doth evidently suppose the actual reality of this Change; it has then given me just Occasion to make this Objection I have made, and Mr. *Arnaud's* Distinction comes too late.

IT is in vain, he assures us, that the Author of the *Perpetuity* never had the least thought of denying this *Infallibility of Priviledg and Grace*; The Question here is not to know absolutely what that Author believed, or not believed, what he thought, or did not think; when this shall be questioned, we shall always be ready to hear Mr. *Arnaud's* Relation of that matter; but here it concerns us to enquire into the Consequences which may be drawn from his Terms, and whether he hath given me a just occasion to make that Objection against him in my Preface. It will not be sufficient to make Declarations on this Matter, it must be shewed that the Consequence is not true.

Mr. *Arnaud* imagins, he has sufficiently justified his Friend, in asserting, he made not use of the *Infallibility of Priviledg*, because 'tis a Priviledg to be proved, and not supposed, and the Calvinists denying it, it is thence clear, that to make an advantageous use of it, it should have bin established before, which is to say, there ought to have bin an intire Treatise made of the Churches Infallibility, before it could be made use of in this Dispute. But, saith he, to conclude from thence, he hath denyed it, and doth not acknowledg it, is one of the most rash Consequences as ever was drawn, altho that Mr. *Claude* hath done this in the Preface of his Book.

AND



AND this is Mr. *Arnaud's* true Character, that he is never more fierce, than when he is Gravelled, or alleageth things wholly besides the Purpose. We have not grounded our present Objection on the Author of the *Perpetuity's* not using the *Infallibility of Priviledg* for his Principle, this is a wilful mistake. For it has bin grounded on this, that the terms of his Answers to the instances of a Change, which I had affirmed, do oppose this Infallibility which the Church of *Rome* pretends to, and acknowledg no other but that of the People. Now 'tis to this he should apply himself, and not continually entertain us with impertinent *Digressions*.

MOREOVER, what signifies his telling us, that the *Infallibility of Priviledge* is a Principle to be proved, and not supposed, and that the Reason dissuading the Author of the *Perpetuity* from making use of it, is because we deny it. We no less deny the pretended popular *Infallibility*, which is a Principle needs proving, as much as the other. He himself tells us, in the beginning of his eighth Chapter; that the Principle of insensible Alterations, which is directly opposite to that of popular *Infallibility*, is a necessary Foundation to the Calvinists, whereon to build the greatest part of their Doctrines, and that all this great Machine of the pretended Reformation, consisting of so many different Opinions, has almost need upon all Occasions of this Supposition, That the contrary Opinion which it undertakes to overthrow, has bin insensibly Introduced into the Church. And thus does he speak, when he would have us deny him his Principle; but when he would have us grant it him, he then holds another Language. *The Author of the Perpetuity, sais he, does not design to attribute to the People any other Infallibility than that which all the World allows them, and which Mr. Claude doth himself grant.* Never any Person disposed more freely of other mens Thoughts than Mr. *Arnaud*. We Deny, we Confess, according as he pleases, he brings us on his Stage as often as he list; making us say sometimes one thing, and sometimes another, and is not this to Dispute successfully? But whether we Confess or Deny this his popular *Infallibility*, it is all one to me, for here the Question is not about this, but to know whether the Author of the *Perpetuity* has not opposed the *Infallibility*, attributed to the Pope and Councils; this is the true State of the Controversy, and Mr. *Arnaud* is at a loss how to defend himself from it. Lib. I. C. 7.

WHAT signifies his telling us, that there are an infinite number of things, wherein not only the whole Church, and all the People of the Universe, but a particular number of People, a Province, a City, a Borough, a particular Person, is Infallible, that is to say wherein it cannot happen he should be deceived himself, nor would deceive others? Wherefore must we have the Gazer brought in for an Instance of this, who is Infallible, when he tells us any considerable News, such as is the Kings going into the low Countries, the taking of Cities in *Flanders*, the Canonization of St. *Francis de Sales*, the Death of Pope *Alexander* the seventh, and the Election of *Clement* the ninth; If he relates this News only, to advertize us, he began his Book after the Kings Victories in the low Countries, every man may believe as much as he thinks fitting, for we know it is no hard matter to add a Period or two to the beginning of a Book, altho 'tis already far advanced; but be it as it will, I dare say, that Mr. *Arnaud's* Victories will not be so certain as those of our Monarch. If in effect he hath not mentioned this to us, but to confirm by Examples his popular *Infallibility*, I

I have reason to tell him, that these Instances are besides the matter in hand, for there must be a distinction made, betwixt an *Infallibility* grounded on the Testimony of a single Person, or a particular sort of People, and that which is grounded on a whole Body of People. I would call the first if you will, an *Infallibility of Testimony*, and the second, an *Infallibility of Perseverance in one and the same State*. There is a Difference between these two. The first of these may be attributed to a People, a Church, a Province, a City, or a particular Person, without the second. I will grant likewise 'tis impossible, in certain Cases, for the whole Body of a People to be mistaken in the News it relates, tho to speak the truth even this happens not seldom, there being nothing more usually false than popular News. But tho I grant this is Impossible in some Cases, yet this is far enough from acknowledging, that a People governed by certain Persons, may not insensibly without any Noise, alter their Sentiments, and pass over into an Opinion which they knew not before. For to make such a kind of Change as this is, there needs only the Concurrence of two or three great Persons in Authority, to whom all Businesses are referred. We have seen that the face of things in the Church of *Rome*, hath bin changed not long ago, and which hath bin surprizing to several Persons; Mr. *Arnaud* himself has bin interess'd in some of these Changes, and I suppose he would be sorry if the *Infallibility* of Perseverance in the same State, should have bin as firm and unmoveable as the Account which the *Gazetier* gave us of the Death of Pope Alexander. But after all, this does not hinder but that the Author of the *Perpetuity* has oppos'd the *Infallibility* the Church of *Rome* ordinarily pretends to.

AND this is what I would have told Mr. *Arnaud*, had he done me the Honour he mentions, which is, to have conferred with me about my Objection, and perhaps my Answers would have satisfied him. I would have added two Observations, which would have made him better comprehend that his pretended *popular Infallibility* does not well accord with that which he termeth of *Grace*, or *Privilege*. The first of these Observations is, that popular Mysteries being only necessary to Salvation, insufficiently preserved by natural means, that is to say, by the inviolable Inclinations of the People, there is no great need of the *Infallibility* of *Grace*, which will be at farthest, only necessary to the Doctrines which are not popular, that is, to the Questions of the Schools, which the Church may well be without, and which are but (as speaks the Author of the *Perpetuity*.) *Theological Consequences*. The second is, that the Reason wherefore he saith the Author of the *Perpetuity* chose rather the *popular Infallibility* for his Principle, than that of *Grace*, supposeth that this latter is absolutely less evident, and harder to be proved than the first. *This Infallibility of the Church*, saies he, being denied by the Hereticks, cannot be made use of as a Principle against them, unless we establish it by separate Proofs. For the Calvinists without doubt would not take themselves to be sufficiently refuted, upon the Subject of the Eucharist, if we only contented our selves with bringing these Arguments against them. All Doctrines which are condemned by an *Infallible Church* are false: But the Belief of the Calvinists on the Sacrament is condemned by the Catholick Church, which is *Infallible*: Therefore it is false. Not but this Reasoning is good: but the minor Proposition which saith that the Catholick Church is *Infallible*, being a controverted Point, it is thence plain, that before it can be made use of, it must be proved, that is to say, there ought to be made an intire Treatise touching the Churches *Infallibility*, before this Point could be used. For this *Infallibility* is not a thing clear in

it selfs seeing it wholly depends on the Will of God, reavealed in Scripture; The Church not being naturally Infallible; 'tis then by the Principles of Faith, or by a long Train of Arguments, that it must be proved she is supernaturally so. Now to make this Argument good, we must suppose that this Infallibility of Grace cannot be proved but with a great deal of Difficulty, whatsoever Course is taken, whether by Scripture or Reason, for if it could be clearly and briefly proved from Scripture, Mr. Arnaud's Excuse would be vain, for he would be demanded wherefore the Author of the *Perpetuity* has not done it, seeing we require not Arguments where the Scripture plainly expresses it self. His reasoning then to be conclusive, must suppose 'tis impossible for the Author of the *Perpetuity* to prove the *Infallibility of Grace*, without engaging himself in Prolixities and Difficulties. Whence it plainly appears, that this is not a proper Principle for the Unlearned, who are not able to go thro with a long and difficult Discussion. It is of no use to them, according to Mr. Arnaud, and that so much the rather, that he himself hath told us that short and easy ways are needful to such, whereby they may discern the true Church; *Ways, saith he, which Lib. 1. C. 3; free men from those painful Discussions, which Ignorance, dulness of Apprehension, and the Exigences of Life, do make so many Persons incapable of. P. 17.* So that this Principle of the Churches Infallibility, being not to be proved without a great deal of Difficulty, will be only serviceable to the Learned, and of which in effect they have no great need, seeing they can of themselves attain the Knowledge of particular Doctrines, without the help of Authority. And to this is reduced, thro Mr. Arnaud's means, this *Infallibility of Grace and Privilege*, which has made such a noise in the Romish Communion.

THE remaining part of Mr. Arnaud's Book, treats, as I already said, on several other Alterations, which we pretend, have insensibly crept into the Church. But seeing these are Points which do not at all belong to the *Eucharist*, and cannot be well examined without writing a great Volumn on each of them, Mr. Arnaud therefore may take the Liberty, of saying what he pleases concerning them, for I think my self no ways bound to answer him. When he shall assault the Books of Mr. Saumaise, Blondel, or Daille, after the manner he ought, he will not perhaps want an Answer. It is an easy matter, to joyn three or four Passages together, on any Controversy, and thereupon make Declamations. For this is the common course of the World. People usually begin where they will, and end when they please: but were one of these Books I mentioned, examined to the Bottom, and every particular undertaken, I am sure this would not be such an easy Task.

THE supposition of insensible Alterations, is a Principle the Holy Scripture establishes, which right Reason alloweth and Experience confirmeth. St. Paul tells us of a Mystery of Iniquity, which began to appear in his time, and which would, in the end, produce this great effect, he calls a Revolt, or Apostasy; which has all the Characters of an insensible Change, seeing that the Foundations of it were laid in his time, and at length these mysterious Projects should come to their Perfection. Our Reason likewise tells us, that important Alterations which happen in Societies, are never introduced all of 'em at one time, but are brought in gradually; and that it is easier to joyn succesfully together several particular Innovations, each one of which apart seems inconsiderable, and to make thereby a great Alteration, than if



Epist. 106.

this should be undertaken all at once. This is a Maxim amongst all Politicians, and Persons who are capable of prosecuting any Enterprize, but this many times happens of it self without any Design. Experience it self confirms this by sundry Examples; for 'tis after this manner several Arts and Sciences arrive at Perfection: Languages and Customs of Countries are altered; 'Tis after this manner the Power of Princes and other States are encreased or diminished; and not to seek for Instances of this kind, any farther than in the Church, and Christian Religion, by this means hath the Authority of the *Romish* Prelacy arrived through several Ages to that Degree wherein we now see it. Thus were the antient Ceremonies in the administration of Baptism abrogated, and other new ones adopted in their places. Thus has the Opinion of the absolute necessity of the *Eucharist* to the Salvation of little Children, bin abolished, and we have passed over into a contrary Opinion. *Nullus, faith St. Austin, Qui se meminit Catholicae fidei Christianum negat aut dubitat parvulos non accepta gratia regenerationis in Christo, sine cibo carnis ejus & sanguinis potu non habere in se vitam, ac per hoc poenae sempiternae obnoxios.* There is no Christian who holds the Catholick Faith, that either denys, or doubts but that little Children, who have not received the Grace of Regeneration in Jesus Christ, nor participated of the Nourishment of his Flesh and Blood, are deprived of everlasting Life, and consequently lyable to eternal Damnation.

LET Mr. *Arnaud* inform us how this publick Belief came to be changed. *St. Austin* tells us that 'tis an Article of the Catholick Faith, he assures us there is no Christian who doubts of it, that is, it was a popular Opinion: And yet at this day the contrary is held in the Church of *Rome*: how comes this Change? We might produce several other Instances, if they were necessary: but at present one Example is sufficient, to overthrow this false Principle of Mr. *Arnaud's*, and to establish that which appears to him to be so Unreasonable.

Hier. Com. in Epist. ad Tit. C. 1.

YET to speak a word, on each of these Points he has handled, does he think, that on the Subject of Episcopacy, his Discourses will carry it away from *St. Ferom*, who tells us, *That before there were partialities in Religion, and that the People cryed out I am of Paul, and I of Cephas, the Church was governed by a Common-Council of Priests, but since, every one esteeming them whom he had baptized belonged to him, and not to Christ, it was ordained throughout the whole World, that one alone chosen from amongst the Priests, should be set up above the rest, and have the Charge of the Church committed to him, to take away thereby all Occasions of Schisme.*

Com. in Job L. 3.

DOES he think that in the Point of Praying for the Dead, we will abandon the Doctrine of *St. Paul*, who tells us in his second Epistle to the *Cor. Chap. 5.* *That if our earthly House of this Tabernacle were dissolved, we have a Building of God, an House not made with Hands, eternal in the Heavens.* These Words do not suffer us to doubt but that they who dye in the Faith of Jesus Christ do enjoy his glorious Presence in Heaven, whence it follows they have no need of our Prayers. That if the Antients have mentioned the deceased in their Prayers, it is certain they never designed thereby to deliver them from the Pains of *Purgatory* which they undergo to satisfy for their Sins, which is the end the Church of *Rome* doth at this day propose in its Prayers. *We Celebrate,* (faith an antient Author in his Commentaries on *Job*, which are thought to be *Origens*) *Not the Day of our Birth,*

Birth, but that of our Death; for the day of our Birth is an Entrance into Sorrows and Temptations; but that of Death is on the contrary, the end of Sorrows, and a Freedom from all Temptations. We commemorate then the Day of Death, because they who seem to dye, do not so. And for this reason we celebrate the memory of the Saints, and devoutly commemorate our Fathers, or Friends who have departed in the Faith, as well to refresh our selves by the remembrance of the Felicity which they enjoy, as also to desire of God, that we may continue in the same Faith.

DOES Mr. Arnaud expect in that Article of the Church of Rome's touching the Invocation of Saints: that we should believe him rather than Origen, who speaks in the Name of all the Christians in his time, in his Dispute against Celsus, who would have them to worship the Sun, Moon and Stars, seeing they are Celestial Angels. We believe saith he, we ought not to pray unto Creatures, who do themselves pray unto God; especially considering, they had rather we should offer up our Petitions to him, whom they likewise serve, than to them, not being willing we should after any sort share our Devotions.

Origen Cons.  
Cel. l. 5.

AND as to the abstaining from certain kind of Meats, Tertullian who was a Montanist, will shew us better than Mr. Arnaud can, the Judgment of the Catholicks in his time. Arguunt nos, saith he, quod jejunia propria custodiamus, quod stationes plerumque in vesperam producimus, quod etiam Xerophagias observemus, siccantes cibum ab omni carne, & omni jurulentia, & vividioribus quibusque pomis, ne quid vinositatis vel edamus vel potemus. They censure us because we observe particular Fasts, that we make them last till the Evening, that we observe Xerophagies, using dry Meats without Flesh, and Juice, and in that we abstain from Fruits which have over much Juice in them, to the end we may not eat or drink any thing which hath the quality of Wine. And a little farther, as to Xerophagies, they say, that 'tis the new Name of an affected Devotion, and which comes near the Heathenish Superstitions, such as the Mortifications of Isis, Apis, and the Mother of the Gods, which purify by abstinence from certain Meats. And this is in few Words what I had to say on those four Particulars.

Tertul. de je-  
jun. C. 1.

C. 2.

WOULD we keep to the exact Rules of Controversy, we need not proceed to any farther Examination of the rest of Mr. Arnaud's great Volume, which may be said, without breach of Charity, equally to offend both in its quantity and quality. For having shewed, as I have done, that the Treatise of the Perpetuity of the Faith ought to be rejected, upon the only consideration of its Method, it is hence evident I am not obliged to follow Mr. Arnaud in his Voyages to Greece, Muscovia, Persia, Syria, Egypt, Ethiopia, and the Indias. Seeing we will never part with our Proofs of Fact, what need has he of travelling thro all these Countries? Neither the Greeks nor other Christian Nations, considered from the eleventh Century, or from the seventh, will decide the Question touching what has bin believed in the antient Church, to the Prejudice of the Fathers and their Testimony. Yet shall I make him an exact Answer, not out of any Necessity, but only out of Condescension, and upon condition he will remember that I have proved in this first Book these following Particulars.

I. That his Censure touching what I said concerning Mr. Aubertin's Book, is grounded on an extravagant Fancy; That it cannot bear a rational

Interpretation; nor is made with any kind of Sincerity; that it supposeth a great Mistake; that we may conclude thence a Prevarication against the Church of *Rome*; and in fine, may be refuted by Mr. *Arnaud's* own Example. Which is the Summary of the first Chapter.

II. That the Author of the *Perpetuity's* Method is Indirect, and contrary to Nature, seeing he would decide Questions of Right by Matters of Fact, and Questions of Fact by Proofs drawn from Arguments: which is such a disorderly way of Proceeding, as makes his Method justly suspected to be artificial and deceitful.

III. That the Author of the *Perpetuity* has openly assaulted Mr. *Aubertin's* Book, and that after an indirect and artificial Manner, which lies as a Prejudication against him. Which is the Summary of the second Chapter.

IV. That the Design of the Author of the *Perpetuity*, being to destroy the Impression which the Proofs of Fact, or the Passages out of the *Fathers* have made on our Minds, does nothing less than this, whence it follows that his Treatise is wholly Useless. Which are the Contents of the third Chapter.

V. That Mr. *Arnaud* contradicts the Author of the *Perpetuity*, in pretending to defend him, and ruins the whole Design of his Treatise.

VI. That these Methods of *Prescription*, which Mr. *Arnaud* so much glories in, are vain and ineffectual, and that the Course we take to confirm People in the Doctrines of our Church is short, certain, and easy to the meanest Capacities: whereas those Mr. *Arnaud* offers, are tedious, difficult, uncertain, and unintelligible to ordinary Apprehensions: Whence it follows they cannot with a safe Conscience remain in the Communion of the Church of *Rome*.

VII. That the Abridgment of our Proofs of Fact, which I offer'd in my first Answer, has bin regular; and that the Treatise of the *Perpetuity* is but a mere Chaos of Confusion. These three last Particulars are contained in the fourth Chapter.

VIII. That all those pretended Advantages Mr. *Arnaud* hopes to obtain by means of the *Perpetuity*, in relation to the Learned and Unlearned, and to those he terms the Obstinate; are groundless Imaginations, which in fine do only manifest the Unprofitableness of that Treatise. Which is the Subject of the fifth and sixth Chapters.

IX. And lastly, that he cannot excuse the Author of the *Perpetuity*, nor himself from the Charge of Contradicting and Opposing the Infallibility of Popes and Councils, it being an avowed Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*; Which is the Contents of this seventh Chapter.



## B O O K I I.

Wherein is shown, that when it should be true, that those which are called the Schismatical Churches believed *Transubstantiation*; yet would it not thence follow, that this Doctrine was always held by these Christians.

## C H A P. I.

Containing the chief Heads of this whole Controversy touching the Eastern Churches, and their Opinion from the eleventh Century to this Present. Mr. Arnaud's first Artifice laid open.

WE are now come to treat of the Belief of the Greek, and other Eastern Churches, touching *Transubstantiation* and the adoration of the *Eucharist*, and must endeavour to shelter our selves from the violent Insultings of Mr. Arnaud and his Friends. We need not mention how this has bin the Subject of their Triumph, seeing all the World knows it. For the Author of the *Perpetuity* has already threatned us with producing of twenty Millions of Witnesses on his side; and Mr. Arnaud who is not a Person of that Humour as to abate any thing, is continually charging us with *Absurdities, Rashness, Confidence, Convictions, Demonstrations*, and telling us of *Ministers confounded by the number of his Proofs*. He tells the World in his Preface, that he hath left us no reason to doubt, in a matter so apparent as is that of the Consent of all these Christian Churches, in the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*. He tells us moreover in another place, that this is a Point most clear and evident, and that were we not withheld by *Obstinacy*, we should confess as much our selves, and not let our Tongues thus bely our Consciences. Nay even before Mr. Arnaud's Book appeared abroad in the World; it had already gotten the Name of *Invincible*, like to that Legion of old, under the Emperour *Marcus Aurelius*, which caused Fire from Heaven to fall down on the Heads of its Enemies. And we may truly affirm the World hath not bin wanting to usher in this his pretended Victory with their Shouts and Acclamations. Now if it be enquired of Mr. Arnaud, what Advantage he can expect from this whole Controversy; He will tell us, it is the Interest of the Catholic Church, and that he will never be perswaded to suffer one of its clearest Proofs to be snatcht out of his

*3d. Part of the Perpetuity. C. 5. P. 256.*  
*P. 11.*  
*L. 2. C. 24 P. 113.*  
*L. 2. C. 24 P. 115.*

In his Prefa-  
P. 10.

his Hand, seeing it establisheth the Faith of a Mystery, wherein consisteth the Object of its Devotion thro the whole World. That God preserves all these Christian Societies, altho divided from his Church, and suffers not the Tyranny of Infidels wholly to swallow them up, nor the knowledge of principal Mysteries to be quite extinguish'd amongst them, to the end they may remain as Witnesses for the Catholick Cause, in testifying the Antiquity of those Doctrines which the new Hereticks deny. If he be demanded whether none of the Doctors of the Church of Rome, have hitherto made use of this Argument; he will tell you, that no one yet hath exactly handled this matter. Which is to say that this great Interest of the Catholick Church, and this Proof, which is one of the most famous she hath, whereby to establish her Faith and Devotion, in respect of this Mystery, was reserved for Mr. Arnaud, and that the Divine Providence has not withheld, for so many Ages the Violence of the Infidels, nor put a stop to the Progress of the Mahometans, nor preserved these Reliques of Christianity in the East, but only for the sake of Mr. Arnaud's excellent Treatise, which was to be the Admiration of the Universe. You must not then think it strange, if he himself after this, hath judg'd it worthy to be Presented to Kings and Princes, and Dedicated even to the Head of the Romish Church, and suffer'd so many Doctors to make Panegyricks in its Praise. What farther remains but that it should be compared to the Saviour of the World. And this Honour has not bin wanting to it.

THE Author of the *Enthusiasms* says, that as the Son of God before his Birth, purify'd John the Baptist his Fore-runner, and having wrought this Miracle, left the Virgins Bosom, to publish to Men the glad Tidings of Peace; So likewise Mr. Arnaud's Book, when as yet in the Bosom of its Author, has replenish'd a great Man with its Divinity, and having begun its Miracles by this Conversion, was published in the time of this late Peace, made in the Roman Church. So far have they carried it on beyond Reason and Christian Modesty.

*NAMQUE* si liceat pusilla magnis plenum & numine numini libellum aquare, ut gravibus licet Poetis. Iis omnibus diem subibis, O quantum omnibus Libelle faustis, quibus Sydereus subit puellus, qui dum delituit tenebricosus sacris visceribus Sacra Puella, quot miracula sunt secuta natum? Hoc monstro fuit auspicatus uno quod cum numinis ad sui perenne lumen & prodomo suoq; Vati futuro ingenitas fugasset umbras, purgasset veteriq; labe fœdum, nil beatius estimarit ille quam per pacificos subire plausus diem, & Virginis sinu Parentis involare sinum recentioris pacis. Quid melius beatiusve iis omnibus diem videbis? O quantum ominibus libelle faustis, ex quo, dum latites tenebricosus, absq; sole, tui in sinu Parentis Dius—immigravit ardor affulsitq; viro undequaq; numen quod imas animi in sui medullas, quando ambilius vir ille sensit chartis gliscere de tuis libelle magis gliscere quo magis magisq; lustraret latebras sinusq; rerum tua luce, liber, nitoribusq; raptus numine quo tumebat intus raptus numine, numen, ecce numen, ibi numeni ait, severiorq; in se se exerit hoc fides libello, Enthusiasmo.

TO all which I have no more to say, but only that I am not at all concern'd at this pretended Divinity, and that Mr. Arnaud's Thunder has neither scared nor hurt me, his twenty Million of Witnesses are no more in my Apprehension than twenty Millions of Phantasms; and in short I doubt not but I shall prove the Truth of these three Propositions. First, supposing that Mr. Arnaud is able to make good his Pretences concerning the Greek and other

ther *Eastern Churches*, from the eleventh Century to this present, it would not hence follow, that either the Alteration here in Question must be impossible, or that it hath not actually hapned, and consequently, that this tedious Dispute on this Subject is vain and useless, in respect of the main of the Cause which I defend. Secondly, That the true *Greek Church*, and others whom the *Latins* call Schismaticks have never reckoned *Transubstantiation*, nor the Adoration of the Sacrament amongst the Articles of their Creed. Thirdly, That all Mr. *Arnaud's* Endeavours to prove the Affirmative, are Ineffectual, and that even the greatest part of his Proofs conclude the contrary of what he pretends. And for as much as it may not be amiss to enquire into the Reasons of this his pretended Triumph so loudly proclaimed, we shall therefore in confirming these three aforementioned Propositions, observe likewise how Mr. *Arnaud* imposes on the World, to the end his Proceedings may be the better laid open.

TO Evidence then the Truth of the first of them, we must begin from the State of the *Eastern Churches*, since the eleventh Century, that is to say from the time *Berengarius* was condemned; to this present, for by this means we shall come to know those happy Fields which have furnished Mr. *Arnaud* with so many Laurels, and at the same time discover the first of his Artifices, whereby he would conceal the Condition of those Churches, to the end he might make the World believe the Argument he draws from their Consent, hath all the Weight and Strength which it is possible for Arguments of this Nature to have. I say since the eleventh Century to this present, because that Mr. *Arnaud* having divided his Discourse touching the *Greeks* into two parts. The first from the seventh Century to the eleventh, and the other from the eleventh to this present, and having begun with this latter part, I am thereby obliged to follow his order, that I may accommodate my self as much as in me lies to his Method. It must then be remembred, the present Question only concerns these Churches, and especially that of the *Greeks*, from the eleventh Century to this present; for we shall examine in its place this other part of Mr. *Arnaud's* Discourse, which reacheth from the seventh to the eleventh Century.

IT must not be imagined, these Christian Churches are now in as flourishing a Condition as they have bin heretofore. For they lost soon after the eleventh Century their anient Splendor, being fallen into a most profound Ignorance, and corruption of Manners, and a horrid Croud of Superstitions, and Disregard to the Mysteries of Religion; Which State of theirs instead of being amended by time, has grown every day worse.

*WILLIAM* Arch-Bishop of Tyre, describing the Causes of the Inundations of the Barbarians into Syria, and the Holy Land, and of this long Servitude of the *Eastern Christians*; *The Faith*, saith he, *and fear of God departed the whole Earth, and especially from amongst them who styled themselves the Faithful. Justice and Equity were no longer to be found amongst them, for Fraud and Violence reigned everywhere, and Malice had taken up the Place of Virtue, so that the World seemed to be at its Period, and the time of the coming of the Son of Man at hand. For the Charity of many waxed cold, and there was no longer Faith to be found on Earth. The whole Face of things was changed, and a man would have thought the Universe to be at the point of falling into its antient Chaos. The Princes instead of keeping their Subjects in Peace, broke their Alliances and made War upon every frivolous Occasion. Wasting whole*  
*Provinces*

*Bel. Sc.  
L. 1. C. 8.*



Provinces by their *Violences*, and exposing the Goods of the Poor to the fury of the rude *Soldiery*, there being nothing which could be preserved from their *Snares*. Men were haled into *Prison*, and suffered the most exquisite *Torments* to make them confess and resign up their *Estates*. Neither could the *Churches Treasure*, nor *Monasteries* escape their *Hands*, altho their *Priviledges* and *Immunities* had bin granted by *Princes*. The *Sanctuaries* were *Violently* broke open; the *Vessels* dedicated to *Gods Service*, together with the *Sacerdotal Vestments* and *Ornaments* were forcibly carried away. The *Churches* were no longer a shelter to the *Miserable*. The *High-ways* were filled with *Robbers*, who spared neither *Pilgrims* nor *Religions*. The *Towns* and *Cities* were as little free from *Danger*, being full of *Cut-throats* who laid wait for innocent *Blood*. *Fornication* in all kinds was common, and suffered without shame or *Punishment*, as at being lawful. Men added *Incest* to their *Adulteries*, and *Chastity* which is a *Virtue* so acceptable to *God*, was grown out of use amongst them, as well as *Moderation* and *Sobriety*, which were forced to give Place to *Luxury* and *Drunkennes*. And as to the *Ecclesiasticks*, they lived no more regularly than the others, it was the same with the *Priest* as with the *People*, as speaks the *Prophet*. For the *Bishops* growing careless, became dumb *Dogs*, having *Respect* to *Persons*; They besmeared their *Heads* with the *Oyl* of *Sinners*, like *Hirelings* abandoning their *Flocks*, and leaving them to the *Mercy* of *Wolves*; and becoming *Simonists* they forgot the *Word* of *God*, freely you have received, freely give. The *Almighty* then being provoked by so many *Crimes*, did not only suffer the *Faithful* in the *Holy Land* to remain in *Bondage*, but farther to *Chastise* them who were at *Liberty*, he stirred up *Belphe*rus the *Satrapas* of *Perfia* and *Assyria* against *Romainus* Sur-named *Diogenes*, *Emperour* of the *Greeks*.

Jacobus de Vitriaco. L. 1. c. 14. JAMES de Vitry, who makes almost the same Observations touching *Gods Displeasure* against his *Church*, addeth moreover a thing very likely, which is, that the *Carelessness* and *Ignorance* of the *Prelates*, and the several *Heresies*, which had then infected the *East*, occasioned the *successfulness* of the *Mahometan Religion*.

Allat. de Eccl. Occid. & Orient. Perpe. Consens. L. 2. c. 13. LEO Allatius, discoursing of the State of the *Greeks* during the twelfth Century, tells us that, after the *Death* of the *Emperor Emanuel*, the *Grecian Empire* began every Day to *Decay*, either by the *Inursions* of them of the *West*, and the *Barbarians* of the *East*, or else through the *softness* and *delicacy*, or *Tyranny* of the *Emperors*, or *Avarice* of their *Ministers*; and frequent *Insurrections* of the *Nobility*, till such time as at length, this *Empire* was miserably oppressed by the *Armies* of the *Latins*. Religion it self likewise was involved in the *Ruin* of the *Empire*, for matters were no longer determined by *Reason* and *Honesty*, but by *Rage* and *Hatred*, which transported mens *Spirits* into *Rashness* and *Fury*. At that time all things were in *Confusion*, *Divine* and *Prophane*, the *Just* and *Unjust* were mixt together without any *Discrimination*, and these *Christians* (who had indeed no more of *Christianity* but the *Name*) instead of obeying the *Doctrine* of the *Church*, minded nothing but how to be revenged on their *Enemies*.

Rubin qui's his Voyage. C. 13. WILLIAM de Rubruquis an *Emissary* sent by *Pope Innocent* the fourth to the *Tartars*, in the Year 1253. Relates that the *Allains*, which are said to be a kind of *Christians* that speak the *Greek Language*, and have *Grecian Priests*, but are so *Ignorant*, that they know not any of the *Ceremonies* belonging to the *Christian Religion*, and scarcely have learned any thing more than the *Name* of *Christ*.

THE Author of the History of the Council of *Florence*, relates a matter which sufficiently shews the Ignorance and small Capacity of the *Greeks*, for he tells us, that when the Emperor *Fohn Paleologus* determined to go in Person to the Council, and take along with him some of his Clergy, he sent for *Marcus of Ephesus* and *George Scholarius*, who altho they were the most Learned in the Empire, yet were fain to apply themselves to the studying of *Cabasilas's* Treatise, and to send to Mount *Athos* for Books, to the end they might be instructed in the Points Controverted between the two Churches.

AND 'tis in effect in the Monasteries of this Mount, wherein hath for a long time bin confined all the Knowledge and Learning of this Church, to which Mr. *Arnaud* Consents; for he tells us, that this Place is the Seminary of all the Religious in the East, because they who are there Educated, do afterwards disperse themselves over all the Provinces of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, and are usually settled as Superiours over the rest. So that adds he, the Doctrine of Mount *Athos*, is the same of that of all the Religious of the East, and the Belief of the Religious of the East, is the same with that of all the Bishops, who are all taken hence. Whereupon we may conclude I think from Mr. *Arnaud's* own Testimony, that the Knowledge at *Athos* is that of all Greece, and consequently to understand wherein consists this Knowledge, we need but Read what they Relate who have travelled into these Countries: The *Greeks* belonging to the Monastery of Mount *Athos*, saies *Belon*, have bin far more Learned heretofore than at present. There are not any of them now but are very Ignorant, there being not to be found above one knowing Caloier in each Monastery. He that desires to have Books of Divinity, in Manuscripts may be furnished with some, but as for any Books of Philosophy or Poetry they have none. We must attribute this loss of Greek Books to the Carelessness and Ignorance of that People who are totally Degenerated. And not only within our own Memory, but for a long time there has not bin any Learned Man thro out all Greece. Amongst the six thousand Calojers that Inhabit the Mountain, in so great a Multitude I say, scarcely can we find above two or three in a Monastery that can Write and Read.

*JOHN Cottovic* speaking of the Monks of this Mount, and others that inhabit the Mountains of *Sinay* and *Olympus*, tells us they apply themselves particularly to Husbandry, that they Live on their Labour, and that there are few of them addicted to Study, the greatest part of them being very Stupid and Ignorant.

HE that wrot the Voyage of Mr. *De la Haye* who went Embassador from the late King to Constantinople, gives almost the same account of the Learning of those good Religions: we Visited, saith he, Mount *Athos*, which they call the Holy Mountain, because of five thousand Calojers who live in great Austerity in twenty three Monasteries about it; these Religious are of *St. Basils* Order, and acknowledge the Patriarch of Constantinople for their Head. They are greater Lovers of an Active than a Contemplative Life, for there are few of them that can read; so that the greatest part employ themselves in Tilling of the neighbouring Grounds, which are very fertile.

*ANTHONY* *Caucus* Arch-Bishop of *Corfu*, giving an Account to Pope Gregory the thirteenth, of the State of the Greek Church in his time, describes it after this manner. There is no body but knows, saies he, that the

*Synopul. Sec. 3. C. 7.*

*Lib. 4. C. 8. P. 400.*

*Belon's Observations. L. 3. C. 39, & 40.*

*linebar. Hist. rosol. & Syr. L. 2. C. 6.*

*Mr. Hays Voyage. Paris Edit. 2. 1629. P. 338.*

*De Græcor. recentior. bar. ad Greg. XIII. L. 6. Mr. ex biblio. Reg. P. 75.*

*Arts and Sciences came from Greece, as the Hero's out of the Trojan Horse. But it is now much otherwise, for I found so much Ignorance of all things amongst these modern Greeks, and especially the Priests that have the charge of Instructing the People, that scarcely do they know how to read the Church Service. And we need not be astonished at this: for those that are called to the Exercise of the Ministry are Tradesmen, who leaving their Shops and Trades become immediately Papas. It is ordinarily observed in Greece, that to day you may see a man who is a Taylor, to become to morrow a Priest. To day he is a Perfumer or Barber, who the next day is a Papas. To day a Goldsmith, and to morrow a Prelate. If you ask them concerning their Belief, or Ceremonies, and require a Reason for their Customs, they return no other Answer, but they follow their Predecessors. If you proceed farther and ask who these Predecessors were, they become mute.*

*It. n. r. L.  
C. 13.*

THE same *John Cottovic* whose Testimony I already produced concerning the Monks of Mount *Athos*, *Olympus*, and *Sinay*, affirms the Religious thro out all Greece, to be no better learned than those aforementioned, *That which I find*, saies he, *most despicable in this Nation, is, they have no town nor City, wherein there are any Schools or Colledges for the bringing up of their Youth. Neither take they care to form their Childrens Minds, to Arts or Sciences. They are so averse to Learning, that they seem as it were to be afraid of it: So that we may truly affirm, Learning is wholly banished from Greece, which was heretofore the Mother of it. For at this day there is not the least Trace to be found of it, the Greeks becoming Barbarians with the Barbarians.*

*Observat. L. 1.  
C. 3.*

*BELON* made the same Observation before him: *All the Greeks, faith he, as well those under the Venetians, as them under the Turkish Empire, are so marvelously Ignorant at this day, that there is not a City thro out all their Country, wherein there is any University; for they care not to have their Children Instructed.*

*Holy Land.  
L. 2 C. 2.*

*EUGENIUS* Roger, a Franciscan Fryar, who was an Emissary in *Barbary*, tels us ( in his Description of the Holy Land, *That the greatest part of the Religious and Secular Priests* ( he means of the Greeks in *Palestine* ) are extremely Ignorant, and apply themselves to mean Exercises, and mechanical Arts.

*Thevenot's  
Voyages. Part  
1. P. 182.*

Mr. *Thevenot* confirms the same, in his Voyages, where speaking of the Greeks of the Isle of *Chios*. *Learning*, faith he, *is a Stranger to them of that Country, being all extremely Ignorant.* And a little farther, speaking of the Island of *Nixia*, and of a Church there, *it is served*, saies he, *by Monks, who are all of 'em Peasants, void of Learning, and 'tis not only so there, but 'tis the same in all the Islands of the Archipelago, they are so Ignorant that it may be truly said of them, they Worship the unknown God.*

*Relation of  
the Isle of St.  
Erini C. 9.*

*FRANCIS* Richard the Jesuit, in his Relation concerning the Isle of *St. Erini*, makes the same Observation, *the Ignorance*, saies he, *of our Mysteries is so great in Turkey, especially where the Emissari's have not frequented, that I wonder, considering the several particular Difficulties in our Faith, and the Temptations they have offered them to leave it, that all of 'em do not take the Turbant, after the same manner as them of Candia, where above sixty thousand Persons have already done it.*



*Du Loir*, discoursing of the *Arnautes*, or *Albanaises*, (that are a kind of People whose Original is scarcely known,) they are, saies he, dispersed over the Campains of Greece and call themselves Christians, but yet know nothing of our Religion more than the Name, and exercise no more of it but the Sign of the Cross.

*Loir's Voyages. P. 303.*

BUT it may be perhaps answered, there ought not to be the same judgment made of the Greeks at Constantinople; seeing the Patriarchal Church being there, it is likely they are not so Ignorant as the others, where the same Care has not bin taken for the Preservation of Religion. I am willing to believe that if there be any Knowledge left in Greece, the Church of Constantinople hath it, and yet if we would know the Condition of this Church we need but read *Fohn Barbareau's* the Jesuits Letter which was written from Constantinople, the tenth of July, 1667. The Schismatical Greeks, saies he, which are in this City to the Number of three hundred Thousand, are so many Souls to be won to our Saviour, because that in effect, after they have told us they are Christians, and for a Testimony thereof have crossed themselves, there is no other sign of Christianity to be expected from them: for as to what concerns Prayers and other religious Exercises they are Names and Things unknown to them. I have oftentimes asked Persons whom I took to be the most intelligent amongst them, whether there were more Gods than one, and whether Jesus Christ from whom they derived their Name, was God and Man, and several other Questions which are put to Children in France, when they learn their Catechism. But they all of 'em answered they were not so deeply learned in Divinity as to answer such great Points, and when I told them they were bound to know these things under Pain of Damnation, I perceived they were not much troubled thereat, for as they believed nothing, so they feared nothing. Now not only the common People and Seculars are no better Learned, but most of their Prelates, and others of the Clergy. I have oftentimes asked the Priests of religious Orders, who were brought up all their life times in Monasteries, concerning their Belief, whether they thought there was more than one God, and whether Jesus Christ was the true God, and other principal Mysteries, but I could not find one amongst them able to answer me. And some of 'em being ashamed of their own Ignorance and Stupidity, made this Excuse, that their Abbot knew all these things, but for their parts they never studied Divinity. And demanding how it was possible they could live twenty or thirty Years in a Monastery, without hearing any Mention made of these necessary Points, they thereupon told me, that in Monasteries and in all other places, all their Endeavours are laid out in getting their Living; (He afterwards tells us) that one of the chiefeft Causes of this Disorder is, that the Patriarch buys his Patriarchate, and sells all other Ecclesiastical Promotions, and that the Arch-Bishops, and Bishops do the same to their inferiour Clergy. Neither must we imagine other Eastern Christians in a better Condition than the Greeks. *Pietro Della Vallé* a famous Traveller, assures us, that the Christians at Bagdad, being of several Communions, know nothing of Religion, but its Name, and to make the sign of the Cross, having no Churches, Sacraments, nor Persons who can administer them, or if they have, their Priests are so Ignorant that 'tis impossible for them to instruct the People in those things, they themselves do not understand.

*Forrain Letters sent to the Procur. of the Emiff. printed at Paris, 1688. Let 1. P. 3.*

*Pietro Della Vallés Voyages. Tom. 1. P. 76.*

THE same Author speaking of the Christians of *Presbyter Fohn*, there are, saies he, I know not how many Chaldean Christians, called Christians of St. John or Sabea, but have no more of Christianity than the name, for they have

*Tom. 4. P. 434.*

no other Church but the Lodgings of a Priest, a very ignorant man, which place they had in my time, and where scarcely any body assists at Divine Service. They keep no Fasts, nor observe any Abstinence from Meats, Eating indifferently of all sorts, neither have they scarcely any thing like a Sacrament amongst them. He observes the same concerning the Georgiens, they are, saies he, less infected with Errors than others, and being less addicted to Learning than the Greeks, they have less Malice, and more Ignorance.

Herbert's  
Voyages L. 2.  
P. 244.

*THOMAS Herbert*, a famous English Man, ( whose Voyages are Translated into French, by Mr. De Vicqfort ) speaking of these same Georgiens, in the City of Assepose, saies he, and thereabouts, dwell near forty thousand Georgiens, and Circassians, who all of 'em profess Christianity, but live most miserable Lives, being Slaves, and destitute moreover of all Knowledge of the Christian Mysteries, only they have a great Veneration for St. George, who was Bishop of Cappadocia, and their Apostle.

Thevenot's  
Voyages Part  
24 C. 75.

Montconis  
Voyages.  
P. 129.

AS to what concerns the *Coptites*, they are said to be as Ignorant as any of the rest. These *Coptites*, saies Mr. Thevenot, are a sort of very dull and stupid People, so that there can be hardly found a Person amongst them who is fit to be a Patriarch. Montconys, after the same manner tells us, that the *Coptites* hold the heretical Doctrine of Dioscorus, Patriarch of Alexandria, and are very Ignorant in matters of Religion.

Description  
of the Holy  
Land. L. 2.

*EUGENIUS Roger*, a Franciscan Fryer, one of the Popes Emiffaries in Barbary, speaking of these *Coptites*, tells us, That this Nation is the most dull and Ignorant of all the Eastern Christians. They are never heard to discourse concerning Divine Mysteries, or Religious Matters. The greatest part of their Priests can neither Write nor Read, and seem to act with as little Reflection as brut Beasts, as far as I could perceive, all the time I sojourned in Egypt, He adds, that the greatest part of the Religious, who dwell in Monasteries in the Deserts of Thebes, are extream Brutish, and work like Horses.

Spond. Ann.  
Tom 3. Ann.  
1561.

Gouveau's  
Relations.  
L. 3. C. 3.  
P. 308.

Mr. De Sponde Bishop of Pamiez, giving an Account in his Annals of a pretended Union of the *Coptites* with the Church of Rome, made in the Year 1561, Pius the fourth being Pope, he tells us amongst other things, that their Patriarch whose Name was *Gabriel*, was a very ignorant Man, and one of their Errors was, they reckoned seven Sacraments, and instead of those of Marriage, Confirmation, and extream Unction, they substituted Faith, Fasting, and Prayer, which they adopted into the Number of Sacraments. The *Armenians* are no less Ignorant, for *Anthony de Gouveau* tells us they are a People wholly Unlearned and Simple, and that moreover David their Patriarch knew no more than only to Write and Read in his own Language, which is, adds he, a thing very common amongst them.

Forrain Let-  
ters Lct. 1.

*JOHN Barbereau*, a Jesuit whom I already mentioned, saies they are in Constantinople to the number of above sixty Thousand; and are, if possible, more Ignorant than the Greeks. They hold the same Errors with them, and have a particular Heresy which distinguishes them from the rest. Their Ignorance, addeth he, is so great, that I have heard themselves say, they never go to Church but when they Consecrate, knowing neither the Use nor Design of that Mystery, and who can instruct them in these things? their Patriarchs and Prelates are busied in getting Money, like the Greeks, that they may have whereon to live.

VINCENT

VINCENT le Blanc, speaking of the Christians of the *India's*, called the Christians of *St. Thomas*, and who follow the *Nestorian* Herefy, the Christians of these Places, saies he, have still retained some part of the Instructions left them by *St. Thomas*, but they are extream Ignorant in the principal Articles of Faith, and know not how to sing in their Churches, so that 'tis a hard matter to keep them in any kind of Tune.

*Le Blanc's Voyages. Part i. P. 115.*

THE Inhabitants of the *Ile of Socotora*, saies *Du Farric* the Jesuit, call themselves Christians (being likewise Christians of *St. Thomas*, that is to say Nestorians) they very much honour and reverence the Cross. They are all of them very Ignorant, so that they can neither Write nor Read, and 'tis the same with their Caciques (that is to say their Priests) who having learned certain Prayers by rote, sing them in the Church, and often repeat a Word which comes near to our *Halleluja*.

*History of the East Indies. L. i. C. 6. P. 84.*

THIS same *Du Farrick*, who wrote the History of the Reduction of the Nestorians of *Malabar* to the Obedience of the Pope, which was brought to pass by *Alexis de Meneses* Arch-Bishop of *Goa* in the Year 1599, does sufficiently set forth the Ignorance of this People. For he tells us, that there was so great Confusion amongst them, in respect of the essential form of Baptism, that every *Cacanar* (for so do they call their Priests) baptised after a several manner, and the greatest part of them, (addeth he) cannot be said in any kind to administer the Sacrament, seeing they use not Words essential thereunto. So that the Arch-Bishop found one of the greatest Towns of this Bishoprick of (*Angomale*) to have bin deficient in this important Point of our Religion, whereupon he privately Baptised the greatest part of the People, after a right and due manner. He relateth moreover that there were several amongst them who were not Baptised at all, and yet received the *Eucharist*, which was a very common thing amongst them, that they usually did not Baptise their Children till some Months or Years after their Birth: and that there were some at ten or eleven years of Age Unbaptized. That they were wont every Sunday to kindle a Fire in the middle of the Church, and having cast Incense thereon, every one drew near to take of the Smoak with his Hand, with which carrying it to their Breasts, they thought thereby their Sins were chased out of their Souls. He adds, that the *Latin Bishop* which was sent them, after their Reduction, visited several Places of his Diocess, in which there had no Prelate bin for this thirty Years, where he found such a Degeneracy both as to Points of Faith and Manners, that most of them had no more of Christianity in them but the Name.

ALTHO the *Maronites* have bin long since reconciled to the Church of *Rome*, yet are they not better Instructed than the rest. *Joseph Besson* in his Treatise of the Holy Land, saies, They are stricken with four Plagues worse than the Plagues of *Egypt*, viz, Ignorance, want of Devotion, Usury, and Injustice, they can scarcely be perswaded, saies he, that the second Person of the Trinity is the Son of God; and that *Jesus Christ* who is God, dyed, and that God ever had a Son. It is incredible say they with the *Turks*; How can he have a Son seeing he was never married? and if he was God how could he dye?

I could easily produce several Testimonies touching the State of the *Moscovites*, *Abyssins*, and *Jacobites*; for their Condition is no better than the rest, God having suffered all these Churches which were heretofore so favoured with



with the Light of his Truth, to fall insensibly into so great Darknes, that a man can scarce perceive the least Mark of Christianity amongst them. *There is not in Moscovia, saies Possevin the Jesuit, any Greek Books or Academies; having made diligent Search for some that understood Greek, I could find none. They have heaped up Error upon Error, and altho they brag of their Christianity above other People, yet do they refer all things to the Wisdom of their Prince as to an Oracle, having imbibed this Principle from their Infancy. They value not Strangers nor suffer them to come into their Country unless they be Polanders, Germans, or Portugaisers, for they despise all others. He saies moreover the Moscovits have such Confidence in their Prince, that when they are asked touching any Point, they commonly answer, God only and our Prince know that. Our great Czar knows all things, he can immediately solve all Difficulties. There is no Religion whose Ceremonies and Opinions he is not acquainted with. Whatsoever we have or are, whether on Horsback, or in Health, 'tis all owing to our great Prince, he saies farther, they have neither Schools nor Academies amongst them, only bringing up their Children to Write and Read, learning them the Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, a certain Chronicle which they have, with some of St. Chrysostom's Homelies, and the Lives of some of their Saints, that should any Person endeavour to make a farther Progress in Learning, he would be in danger of being punished. As to their Priests and Monks, he assures us, they are prodigiously Ignorant, for having demanded of them who was the founder of their Order, not one of them could answer him; and as to the People he saies, they work at all times, not excepting Sundaies and Holydaies, and think it belongs to Gentlemen, and not to them to frequent the Church. That they are very well pleased with their own Simplicity, and often make the Sign of the Cross, and are great Worshippers of Images. As concerning the Russians, which are under the King of Poland's Government, he saies, that sometimes their Bishops performe the Divine Service in Greek, altho few of them, if any, do understand that Language, and that they are very Ignorant in Divinity.*

*Biblot. Select.  
L. 6. C. 5.*

*De rebus  
Mosco. P. 2.*

AS to the *Abyssins*, the Relation of the Jesuit *Paex*, which *Du Farrick* has inserted in his History of the *East Indias*, gives us sufficiently to understand their Ignorance. For he tells us, *that the Spiritualities of the Empire, depend wholly on the Emperour. That the Ecclesiasticks do nothing but what he would have them, and that should he command them all to turn Catholicks, they would not disobey him. He tells us he disputed with one of them, upon occasion of the legal Ceremonies which they observe, and that this Person could not tell how to answer him otherwise, than that there were some who could satisfy him on that Point. He farther adds, That these People knowing little, there was immediately spread a Report concerning me, that I was a great Doctor, and thereupon never came any Person afterwards to dispute with me. Du Farrick observes that the Jesuit Paex having taught some Children their Catechisme, the King and all his Court were so astonished at the matter, that he told those about him, saying, what should our Monks dispute with this Father for, who are not able to answer these little Children, the plain Truth of it is, we have neither Doctrine, nor Instruction, neither any thing more than the Name of Christians.*

*History of the  
Indias. L. 16.  
P. 938.*

*MAFFEUS* the Jesuit, relates, that a Priest named *Gonsalvus Rhoderick*, sent from *Goa* to *Clandus* King of the *Abyssins*, in the Year 1556. Found him and his greatest Courtiers very Ignorant both in the Knowledge of Councils, and all kinds of Divine and Humane Learning. These are his own Words.

Mr.

Mr. De Sponde, relating in his Ecclesiastical Annals the principal Articles of their Belief, according to the Confession of Zaga Zabo, concludes in these Terms. *They have so many ridiculous Fopperies amongst them, that they have scarcely any thing more of Christianity than the Name.* *Annal. Eccl. ad Ann. 1524.*

MOREOVER they are not only Ignorant of the Mysteries of Religion, but likewise in all kinds of Learning, which made Besson the Jesuit say concerning Syria. *That the Sciences are more rare in the Eastern Parts than the Phenix, and mechanical Arts more prized than Sciences, wherefore, addeth he, the continual multitude of Books which encrease every Day in Europe, continually decrease in Syria. The best of them have already passed the Seas, several of which are to be seen in the Libraries in France, so that those which remain are very ordinary ones.*

TO this gross Ignorance, we may joyn their Superstition, the usual attendant of Ignorance; for 'tis certain these People are incredibly guilty of it. *The Armenians according to the Testimony of Nicephorus, still Celebrate Easter after the manner of the Jews, slaying Sheep and Oxen, and sprinkling the Posts of their Doors, with the Blood of a Lamb, and instead of communicating of the Blood of our Saviour, they Sacrifice a Lamb, which being Roasted they divide it amongst them. This Custom being a very antient one, is yet in use amongst them.* *Hist. r. Eccl. L. 18. C. 53.*

BESSON the Jesuit tells us, *They call this Sacrifice Korban, and that he that offers it, causeth a Sheep to be brought to the Church Porch, where the Priest blesses Salt, and puts it down the Throat of the Sacrifice, afterwards Consecrates the Knife, and then laies his Hand on the Head of the Sheep and cuts its Throat, The Bishop and Priest take their Share, one part whereof is distributed to the Poor, and another serves for the Feast, which is Celebrated with all publick Testimonies of Rejoycing. The same Emissary informs us, that the great Disorders of the Levant are its Superstitions, and the Peoples Recourse to Magicians, the number of whom is very Considerable amongst Christians, whose Poverty and Sickneses make them use these wretched Remedies,* *Holy Syria. Part 1. of the Armenians. P. 48.*

THE Coptites, and Abyssins, besides Baptism, use Circumcision, which they receive the eighth day, after the manner of the Jews. The Abyssins Baptise themselves every Year on Twelfth-Day, in the Lakes or Ponds, in remembrance of our Saviours Baptism. *Possevin relates the same of the Moscovites. For he tells us that twice a Year, viz. on the day of the Epiphany, and that of the Assumption, the Metropolitan Blesses the River of Mosco; and that the Priests Bless after the same manner other Rivers, that several Men and Women Wash themselves therein with the Ceremony of a triple Immersion; that the Horses and Images are Baptised in like manner, and that this in their Language is called Baptism.* *Bauchet Bonquet sacr. L. 4. C. 7. Erce-wood's Inquiries. C. 22, 23. Villamont, & alii passim de reb. Mosco. P. 6.*

I scarce know what to think of that Custom amongst the Greeks, of taking up their Dead, a Year after they are buried. If they find their Bodies are not yet consumed, they examine what remains of them, and if it doth not stink, but hath a good Colour, they esteem that Person a Holy Man: But if on the contrary, the Corps be Black or Swelled, they repute him to have bin an ill Liver, and an Excommunicated Person. Wherefore it is, that in their form of Excommunication, one of their Imprecations is, *that such a Person* *Christoph Angel. Stat. Crit. Eccl. Græc. C. 25. vide Annot. Geor. Felsau. Eucolog. Geor. P. 68. Allat. Epist. de quarund. Ciacor. q. 11.*  
may

may not be consumed after Death, neither in this World nor in that which is to come, but that he may be swelled like a Drum. They verily believe this is perfectly accomplished: And *Leo Allatius* tells us several Stories of those Phantasms which they call *Burcolaques*, which are faith he, *Excommunicated Persons*, who being deceased torment the living, and of whom the *Greeks* are as much afraid, as our Children, when we tell them of Fryar *Bonrru's* Ghost. Nay so greatly are they Prepossessed with false Opinions, as to imagine an Excommunication pronounced by a Christian that afterwards turns Turk, produces the same Effect, that is to say, keeps the Body from Consuming, and causes it to grow hard and swell, till such time as this Excommunication be taken off by him who pronounced it, altho never so great an Infidel. Which is confirmed by *Leo Allatius* concerning the *Patriarch Raphael*, who to dissolve the Body of an excommunicated Person, was forced to apply himself to a Renegado for his Absolution.

*Christoph.  
Angel. C. 42.*

*Annot. Al.  
lat. de quo-  
rund. Græcor.  
opinat. & alii  
passim.*

WE may reckon in the Number of the Grecian Superstitions, the belief they have long held, touching a Miracle that happens every Year, in the Sepulcher at *Ferusalem*, on the Saturday before *Easter*, which is, That all the Lamps being extinguished, the Patriarch enters alone into the Sepulcher, and God sends a Beam of Light from Heaven, wherewith he kindles the Torch he holds in his hand, and therewith lights all the rest. Which is performed with great Ceremony, and publick Acclamations of Rejoycing, not only by the *Greeks*, but all the Eastern Christians which are at *Ferusalem*, for they all hold this Miracle to be true.

*Christoph.  
Angel. C. 42.*

NEITHER do they at all suspect the Truth of another Miracle, which they say happens once a Year in *Caire*, near the River of *Nile*, and which lasts from Holy Thursday to Ascension Day. Which is, that in several Countries the dead Bodies arise out of their Graves: But this Miracle only happens when they celebrate *Easter* according to antient Custom; Whereas should they Celebrate it according to the new Kalender, the Miracle would infallibly cease, as it fell out about fourcore or a hundred Years since, when the *Greeks* altered the time of the Celebration, upon which the dead Bodies arose no more, and the Sacred Fire was also withheld from the Sepulcher, which obliged them to the Observance again of the former Day, whereupon the Miracles returned. And this Relation we have from *Christophorus Angelus*, and some others. We might give a farther Description of the Ignorance and Superstition of these poor People, were not what has bin already mentioned sufficient to inform the World of M. Arnaud's vain Triumphs. For when it should appear that all these Sects held *Transubstantiation* and the *real Presence*, what Advantage would accrue to him thereby? Would it hence appear impossible that these Doctrines have crept in amongst them, by the same means the true Mysteries of Christianity have slipt out; for Ignorance and Superstition are but sorry keepers of Evangelical Truths. It is easy to impose on these People whose Minds have bin so darkned with Errors, all marks of Christianity having bin long since lost amongst them. They may be made believe any thing, being in this respect as white Paper, whereon men may write what they please. There needs but one mans falling into an Error, to draw all the rest after him. And this Mr. Poulet hath well observed in the Account he gives us of the *Nestorians*, who still obstinately retain their old Errors, for which Reason they are hated by all the *Levantine Christians*, They know not what they Believe, saies he, being ready to receive any new Opinion, be it what it will, provided it includes not a Submission to the Holy

*Relation of  
the Levant, or  
the Sieur of  
Poulet's Voy-  
age. Part. 2.  
C. 28.*



*Holy See.* Which is as much as to say, they are not firm or Precautioned, against any Article but that of Obedience to the Pope, having bin oftentimes tempted, and sometimes surprized into an acknowledgment of his Supremacy, but as to other Points, they are very Ductil, being ignorant of their Meaning. And these are such People Mr. *Arnaud* desires, and who seem to him fit Objects to ground his Dispute on. He thought to make his Advantage of this Confusion; but certainly he ought to give the World a true account of these Matters, and not so highly to extol his own Victories, seeing the Honour of them is much diminished by what I have already offered.

## CHAP. II.

*That the temporal State of the Eastern People since the eleventh Century, and the Efforts the Latins have made to communicate to them their Religion, do invalidate the Proof which is pretended to be drawn from their Belief. Mr. Arnaud's Artifice discovered.*

**H**ERE is then Mr. *Arnaud's* first Deceit detected, which consists in the concealing from us the real Condition wherein this People have so long layn, as to Religion, to the end the weakness of his Arguments may lye undiscovered.

The second consists in setting before us several impertinent historical Passages, on purpose to avert his Readers Mind, from a due Consideration of those things which he knows would prove disadvantageous to him. It is without doubt a very disingenuous Artifice, thus to change the natural Use and Order of things, and snatch out of mens Sights the true and important Consequences may be drawn thence, by substituting others which are but mere Amusements. And yet this Mr. *Arnaud* has done: for not being able to deny that the temporal State of the Eastern People, since the eleventh Century, hath very much facilitated the Attempts of the *Latins*, establishing their Doctrines in those Parts; He thereupon supposes I affirm the *Greeks* never knew the *Latins* believed *Transubstantiation*: and under pretence of opposing this Fancy sprung from his own Brain, he retails out the History of the *East*, to shew that the *Greeks* could not be ignorant of the Belief of the *Latins* touching the *Eucharist*. I will not insist at present on the little reason he had to charge me with this Opinion; I shall make it appear in the following parts of this Discourse, that this is his Chimera and not mine. I shall only represent here the same historical Passages, Mr. *Arnaud* has produced, in that manner wherein they ought to be proposed, to make a right Judgment of this Dispute, and not in that false View wherein he has represented them. In a Word, I pretend to manifest by those very things he has offered and Perverted, That if the *Greeks* and other Eastern Christians doe believe *Transubstantiation*, as fully as the Church of *Rome*, yet does it not thence follow that this Doctrine has bin perpetual in that Church:

seeing they might have received it from the *Latins*.

L. 2. C. 8.  
P. 172.

FIRST then Mr. *Arnaud* takes a great deal of Pains to prove, there has bin a frequent Commerce between the *Greeks* and *Latins*, for he tells us that *Pisa, Venice, Rome*, and several other Cities of *Italy* were full of *Greeks*, That *Constantinople* was full of *Latins*, and *Latin Churches*; that the *Armies* were usually made up of *Greek, Italian, and French Soldiers*, which were continually in great Numbers at *Jerusalem*, where they communicated in the same Churches from the Hands of the *Patriarch*, and *Priests* of that City; That so great was the multitude of *Pilgrims*, that they administred the Sacrament every Day, that Persons of the greatest Quality, namely *Kings, Princes, and Prelates*, and *Ladies* of the highest Rank, undertook these *Pilgrimages*, and that *Jerusalem* was then, that is to say in the eleventh Century, a place whereunto all the Nations of the World resorted.

I shall not now enter into a Debate concerning what he tells us touching the *Christians* receiving the Communion at *Ferusalem*, from the *Patriarch* and *Priests* of that City. He affirms it without proving it, for there is very little likelihood that Persons of different Churches, who were so greatly divided, would receive the Communion together from the same Person. But be it as it will, I am so far from raising a Contest about this frequent Commerce of the *Greeks*, with the *Latins*, that I take it for granted, to the end I may thereby demonstrate to Mr. *Arnaud* the weakness of his Argument. For when he shall prove, that the *Greeks* believe the Conversion of Substances, and adore the Sacrament, he may then well conclude against me, that I have bin guilty of Rashness in denying it: but he cannot any ways thereby advantage his Cause, seeing it will remain still to be examined, whether these People did not receive these Doctrines from the *Latins*, by means of their mutual Commerce since *Berengarius* was last condemned. What I related in the preceeding Chapter touching the Ignorance which hath reigned for so long a time in those Countries, and the foolish Superstitions which were introduced, even without our Knowledge of their Original, will ever render this Supposition probable, it being no difficult matter to conceive that a Doctrine of this Nature might creep in, in the Dark amongst ignorant and superstitious People, who held a perpetual Commerce with others, that make open Profession of this Doctrine.

L. 2. C. 10.

Mr. *Arnaud* proceeds farther, and relates the History of the *Croisado's* towards the end of the eleventh Century, and in the twelfth, for the Conquest of the Holy Land; and this History does well deserve our Notice; For there will result from it these two Truths, the one, that the bad Condition of the *Greeks*, and other Eastern *Christians* obliged them, how Proud and Haughty soever they might otherwise be, to a servile Complacency with the *Latins*, and to an accommodation with their Humours and Interest: And the other that the *Latines* have not neglected this favourable Occasion, which the Conjunction of Affairs then offered them, to establish their Religion in the East.

Guilliel. Tyr.  
Bell. Sacri.  
Lib. 1. C. 1.

WE all know in what Condition *Palestine, Syria*, and *Egypt* lay, when those of the West went thither. The *Saracens* had overrun these Countries from *Heraclius* his time, that is to say from the seventh Century, and the Power of these Infidels grew formidable to all the World, whilst the *Greeks* strength continually decayed, whether by the Supinety of their Emperours,

perours, or by the horrible Crimes with which the same Emperours dishonoured their Throne. The Turks, having subdued *Persia*, overspread the whole East, and possessed themselves of *Palestine*, *Syria*, *Cilicia*, *Isauria*, *Pam-* Idem l. 5. c. 3.  
*philia*, *Lycia*, *Pisida*, *Lyconia*, *Cappadocia*, *Galatia*, *Pontus*, *Bythinia*; and moreover of a considerable part of *Asia minor*, and so greatly terrified the Greeks, as relates *Wm. of Tyre*, that scarcely did they repute themselves safe within the Walls of *Constantinople*, altho the Sea was as a Rampire betwixt them. The Christians in the East had already received the Benefit of *Charlemain's* Intercession for them to *Aron*, under whose Government they then lived. But this lasted not long, for the Miseries into which they fell afterwards became so intollerable, that towards the end of the eleventh Century, *Simeon Patriarch of Jerusalem*, according to the Relation of *Wm. of Tyre*, Idem l. 1. c. 2. and *Fames de Vitry*, resolved to procure the Assistance of the *Latins*, and write to Pope *Urban the second*, and the Western Princes, as well in his own Name, as in that of the whole Church, by means of a French Pilgrim called *Peter the Hermit*, a Native of the Diocess of *Amiens*. *Wm. of Tyre* observes that in the Conference the Patriarch had with this Hermit, he told him, amongst other things, *That they could expect no help from the Greeks, altho of the same Blood with them, and their Neighbours, because they could hardly preserve themselves, having fallen into such a Declension, that within a short time they had lost above half their Empire.* In effect, Mr. *Arnaud* hath himself very well observed; that the Emperours of *Constantinople* finding them- Gill. Tyr. l. 6. c. 11. Jacob. de Vit. Hist. Orient. c. 16. selves unable to withstand the Turkish Power; implored the Assistance of the Christian Princes in Europe and especially that of the Pope, who at that time was the most Powerful even in Temporals of all Christendom, and that *Alexis Comnenus* sent for that Purpose Embassadors to the Council of *Plaisance*. P. 191.

THIS then was the true State of Affairs amongst the *Greeks*, and other Eastern Christians, which forced them to a great Compliance with the *Latins*, from whose Assistance they expected their Establishment.

THESE Letters of the Patriarch of *Jerusalem*, and the Entreaties of *Alexis*, together with the Sollicitations of *Peter the Hermit*, procured the Expedition of the *Latins* into *Syria* and *Palestine*. The Success is known; I shall say no more but that the Christians of that Country, only changed their Masters; for the *Latins* settled themselves there, not only as Friends, and Deliverers, but Conquerors, which made all things depend on their Will, for as soon as ever they possessed themselves of *Syria* and *Palestine*, they established *Latin Bishops* there, and drove out the *Greek Bishops* from their Churches that would not yield Obedience to the Roman Church, nor accommodate themselves to its way of Worship. Mr. *Arnaud* does not wholly accord with me in this. *We must imagine*, saies he, *there was a mil-* L. 2. c. 10. P. 193.  
*lion of Transubstantiators that passed over from Europe into Asia, and made themselves Masters of a great part of these Eastern Provinces. As soon as they took any City, there was established in it a Bishop of the Latin Communion with a sufficient Clergy for the Service of that Church. Sometimes the Christians of the East ranged themselves under his Obedience, and other times they were permitted to have a Bishop of their own Choosing. He farther adds, that after the taking of Antioch, there was no other Patriarch established than him that was there before, and that he remained for the space of two Years. That after the taking of Jerusalem and other Cities of Syria and Palestine, there was another Patriarch made, and several Latin Bishops, the Greeks and other Christians of Syria being left at their own Liberty as to their communicating with the Latins.*



THIS pretended Moderation of the *Latins* is first of all refuted by the same Author whom Mr. Arnaud quoted, who is *James de Vitry*. *James de Vitry*, saies he, Testifies that the Christians of Syria, who were of the same Religion with the Greeks, had Bishops of their own. 'Tis not possible for an Author to be cited with less Sincerity; for these are *James de Vitry's* Words; The Syrians exactly observe the Customs and Ordinances of the Greeks in the Celebration of Divine Service, and other Spiritual matters, and obey them as their Superiours. But as to the Latin Prelates in whose Diocesses they live, they freely affirm they obey them with their Mouths, but not in their Hearts, superficially, and for fear of their temporal Lords. For they have their own Greek Bishops, and would dread neither the Excommunications nor other Laws of the Latins, did they not fear our Lay-men would break off all Trade and Commerce with them. For they say amongst themselves the Latins are Excommunicated. Now where I pray is Mr. Arnaud's Sincerity in thus alleaging *James de Vitry's* Testimony to prove the Moderation of the *Latins*, who obliged not the Syrians to communicate with them unless they pleased themselves. These Words of his declare the Syrians did still acknowledg their Greek Bishops: But then again on the other hand, that they were constrained for fear of their temporal Lords to acknowledg the Latin Prelates; and render them an external Obedience: which is expressly contrary to what Mr. Arnaud concludes. And yet he has not contented himself with thus alledging *James de Vitry*, in a contrary Sence, but has made a Principle of it; From whence he draws this Consequence, concerning the other Christians: We ought, saies he, to conclude the same of the other Sects of Armenians, Jacobites, and Nestorians, with which all Syria was at that time filled. This seems to me, to be a too free disposal of Principles and Conclusions.

IN the second place, this pretended Moderation is refuted even by those very Letters which Pope Paschal the second wrote to the *Latins* in the East, after the taking of Jerusalem, in which he tells them, he has charged his Legate to endeavour the regulating of the Church, which God has delivered by their Hands, and that which should hereafter be delivered by them, to correct whatsoever should be found contrary to sound Doctrine, to Plant and Edify whatsoever he judged fitting, by their Assistance; which plainly shews that the *Latins*, after they had freed these Eastern Christians from the Tyranny of the Infidels, suffered them not to live according to the form of their own Religion, and that in this respect they subdued them to themselves.

ALLATIUS a Latiniz'd Greek, and keeper of the Popes Library, has bin more ingenuous than Mr. Arnaud, for he freely confesses that the *Latins* established Prelates of their own in the East, and drove out them of the Greeks, when they could do it with safety, and severely chastized Schismatics and Obstinate Persons. And as to what Mr. Arnaud alledgeth out of *Balsamon*, That Antioch only excepted, in all other Cities the *Latins* permitted the Greek Bishops to exercise their Episcopal Functions, altho they had established Bishops in the same Places. I have not met with any such Passage in his *Nomocanon* of the Parisian Edition printed in 1620. Those that published it relate this Passage in a Supplement annexed to the end of the Book, and tell us that these Additions are not to be found in any Greek Copy, but only in the Latin Version of *Gentian Hervetus*; so that the Truth of this Testimony is doubtful, and Mr. Arnaud that seems to have taken his Quotation from *Baronius*, ought to have more certainly informed himself. Howsoever

Ibid.

Hist. Orient.  
C. 75.

Ibid. P. 194.

Baron. ad  
ann. 1100.De Eccl. Oc-  
cid. & Orient.  
Perp. Consens.  
L. 2, C. 13.

Ibid. P. 194.

ever it be, *Balsamon* lived towards the end of the twelfth Century, about a hundred Years after the entrance of the *Latins* into the *East*, in a time wherein their Affairs were in Disorder; for the Infidels had retaken *Jerusalem* with a great part of those Places which were held by the *Latins*: So that we need not wonder if the *Latins* slackned their Rigour towards the *Greeks*, and so much the less, because it appears by this same passage of *Balsamon*, that the Infidels gave the same Liberty to the *Greek* Bishops, to exercise their episcopal Functions in their Dominions.

IT is certain, this Moderation Mr. *Arnaud* speaks of, is a meer Chimera of his own. For immediately after the taking of *Antioch*, there were *Latin* Bishops put into all the neighbouring Cities; the Patriarch for some time kept his Dignity, but at length was forced to withdraw to *Constantinople*, and a *Latin* Bishop was substituted in his room. After this *Dabert* Bishop of *Pisa* was made Patriarch of *Jerusalem*; *Baldwin* Arch-Bishop of *Cesarea*, *William* Arch-Bishop of *Tyre*, *Adam* Bishop of *Pancada*, and all other Diocesses furnished after the same manner, as it appears by *Wm.* of *Tyre's* Account.

*Guilliel. Tyr.*  
L. 6. C. 23.  
L. 7. C. 8.  
L. 9. C. 15.  
L. 10. C. 16.  
L. 11. C. 12.  
L. 1. C. 2.  
L. 15. C. 12.

WE may then I think, without farther Trouble, conclude that the *Latins* did not omit so favourable an Occasion of Introducing their Religion and particular Doctrines in the *East*. We may moreover consider another historical Passage of which Mr. *Arnaud* makes use according to his ordinary manner, which is to hinder us from beholding the just Consequences may be drawn thence: This History concerns the subjecting of the *Grecian* Empire to the *Latins*:

IN the Year 1204. The *Latins* took by Assault the City of *Constantinople*, and seized almost at the same time on the greatest part of the *Grecian* Empire, which they bestowed on *Baldwin* Earl of *Flanders*. They kept it fifty eight Years till *Michael Paleologus* retook *Constantinople*, and drove the *Latins* out of *Greece*. The *Greeks* were no more moderately dealt with after this Conquest, than they were after that of the Holy Land. The *Latins*, saies *Leo Allatus*, established in the places they Possessed Priests and Prelates of their own; who ruled the Church after their manner, and drove away the *Greeks*, whosoever they could do it with safety; and as to the *Rebellious* and *Obstinate* *Greeks*, who would not relent and embrace the Truth, they severely punished them; as they had done heretofore in the *East*, and especially at *Antioch*. He afterwards produces the Testimony of an *Anonymous* *Greek* Author, which I shall here set down, and so much the rather, because of the Consequence which may be made of this History. Since the Emperor *Porphyrogenetus's* time; so that of *John Batatz's*, the *Latins* did nothing else but Plunder Cities and Islands. They expelled the *Orthodox* Prelates from their Seats, and substituted Cardinals in their Places who were of the same Belief with them. And this they did at *Constantinople*, *Cyprus*, *Antioch*, and other Cities, and not content with this, they constrained all the People, not excepting the Priests and Monks, to be of their Opinion, and Communion, and commemorate the Pope. They were Friends to those that obeyed them; but as to them that reprehended them, they treated them as *Hereticks*; and those that abhorred their Communion, were punished openly; even to the making them suffer Martyrdom; and used in the same manner as the *Kings* and *Tyrants* handled the *Primitive* *Christians*. Witness the holy Monks of the *Isle* of *Cyprus*, whom they kept three Years in Prison, because they would not Communicate with them; Inflicting on them all

*De Eccl. Occ.*  
*Orient. Pers.*  
*Consens* L. 2.  
C. 13.

*Ibid.*

*m. anet*

manner of Torments, and in fine, not being able to make them acknowledge their Doctrine to be good, being possessed with Rage they fastned them to their Horses Tails, and drew them over Precipices, causing others to be burnt alive. John their Abbot having remained some time in the midst of the Flames calling upon God, one of these furious Latins struck him down with his Mace into the Fire. And thus did this Holy Man render his Spirit unto his Creator. He farther adds, that the Pope having sent some Monks as Spies, under pretence of a Pilgrimage to Jerusalem, they saw the Patriarch Germain at Nice, who complaining of these Cruelties, received for Answer, that the Pope was troubled thereat, and if the Greeks would send any to make Peace they would be kindly received, It was only, saies he, to deride and impose on us, that they would have us send first to them, as it were to accuse our selves, and acknowledge our Error, which plainly appeared afterwards by their Letters.

It is.

BUT to the end, we may not think *Leo Allatius*, who relates this Complaint of the Greeks, is suspected by the *Latins*, under pretence that he himself is a Greek by Birth, it will not be amiss to see the Answer he makes. If this Author, saies he, means the Greeks, who remaining fixt to their Ceremonies, embraced otherwise the Truth, he is mistaken; For the Latins have bin so far from driving them away, that they have made use of them, as often as they have Occasion. If he means the Schismatics, and those that maintained the Errors of the Greeks, he trifles; for how can he imagine, the Catholics who are so Zealous for the Roman Church, should suffer in a Country, they had Conquered with the loss of their Blood, the Greeks their Enemies and Adversaries to their Faith, to live unpunished? These erroneous People must be reduced, being Rebels to their own Faith, not only by simple Banishments, but by Fire and Sword. And this is *Allatius* his Moderation, which does not well accord with that which Mr. Arnaud attributes to the *Latins*.

L. 3. C. 1.

BUT we need not oppose *Allatius* against him, we need but hear himself, to know whether the *Latins* did not use all manner of Violences, to fettle their Religion amongst the Greeks. After the taking of Constantinople, saies he, the Latins possessed themselves of all the Churches; they established a Latine Patriarch, they filled Constantinople with Latin Priests, they created a Latin Emperor, who was Baldwin Earl of Flanders, and prosecuting their Conquest in Greece, they brought under their Obedience almost whatsoever appertained in Europe to the Emperours of Constantinople. The Grecian Emperour fled into Asia, having but three or four Cities left him, which were all that for a long time remained under the Obedience of the Greeks. Behold here then all Greece subdued not only to the Temporal Authority of the *Latins*, but likewise to the Spiritual Authority of the Popes. He adds a little after, that the Popes Legats used such hard and rigorous Courses to constrain the Greeks to Communicate with the Pope, that at length the Emperour Henry, Baldwin's Successor was forced to take them off mauger the Legat Pelagus. He tells us likewise in another place, that Greece was at that time filled with Dominicans, and Fryar Minorites, that is to say, Inquisitors as he himself calls them, who had often performed this Office in France, and Germany, and signalized themselves by punishing an infinite number of Hereticks, who made it the greatest part of their Skill to discover them, and a great part of their Piety to have them severely Punished, that these Inquisitors were in several places Masters of the Greeks, and were ordered by the Pope to Confer with them, and examine their Doctrine.

L. 3. C. 7.

WERE



WERE not them of the Church of *Rome* fully perswaded of Mr. *Arnaud's* good Intentions towards them; these historical Passages he has offered, were enough to make him suspected. For this deplorable Condition of *Greece* and all the *East*, and the violent Means the *Latins* here used to plant their Religion, for several Years together, that is to say, for near two hundred Years in the *East*, and fifty eight in *Greece*, might well introduce amongst these People, the Belief of a substantial Conversion, and there is methinks, more reason to admire, if this has not hapned, than if it hath.

WE are not yet gotten to the end of Mr. *Arnaud's* Histories. He tells us three things worth our Observation. The first is, *that altho Constantinople was retaken from the Latins by Michael Paleologus, yet they kept still several places in Greece, and even whole Provinces, as Achaia. Secondly, that the Latines were still Masters of divers great Islands, as Cyprus, Crete, Eubee, Rhodes, and divers other Places. Thirdly, that the Necessity the Emperours of Constantinople lay under of obtaining the Assistance of the Western Princes, caused them to keep a continual Correspondency with several of them, and to be in sundry particulars subservient to the Latins which remained at Constantinople, so that there was always a great number there, who made Profession of the Romish Religion.* Here is then the *Latins* again not only mixt with the *Greeks* in their ordinary Commerce; but in several places their Lords and Masters, and in a fit Capacity to make them receive their Religion. L. 3. C. 7.

*LEO Allatus*, tells us likewise that, *when the King of England had Possessed himself of Cyprus, and given it to the King of Jerusalem, that he might return home, the whole Country was immediately filled with Priests and Latin Bishops, to bring over the People to Piety and Orthodoxy.* De Perp. Con-  
sens. L. 2.  
C. 15.

WHEREUNTO Mr. *Arnaud* Consents, and saies, *That they were more rigorously handled for their Religion in Cyprus, than in Greece, that several Greek Authors have grievously complained of these Cruelties; and that Germain the Patriarch of Constantinople, residing in Asia, most pathetically laid open their Sufferings to Pope Gregory the ninth.* L. 3. C. 1.  
P. 256.

*FRYAR Stephen*, a *Portugais*, in his History of the Kingdom of *Cyprus*, *Relates that altho Guy de Lusignan, was King of Jerusalem, yet was he forc'd to be contented with being King of Cyprus. He brought along with him several Greeks, Armenians, Coptites, Maronites, Jacobites, Indians, Nestorians, Iberians, and Georgians, who would not acknowledg the Romane Prelacy, each of these having their own Patriarch. 'Tis true, saies he; that the Kings of Lusignan would not permit their Bishops to exercise any Jurisdiction over them, but orderd they should only administer to them the Sacraments, leaving the Overplus to the Jurisdiction of the Latine Arch-Bishop, to whom these Nations in this respect were Subject.* He likewise *Relates, that about the same time, there was published the Revelation of Jesus Christ to St. Bridget, in which our Saviour himself exhorted the Greeks to submit to the Roman Church. Let the Greeks know, (these are the Words,) that their Empire, Kingdoms, and Lordships, will never be in Peace and Security, but always subject to their Enemies, from whom they will continually receive exceeding great Damages, and perpetual Miseries, till such time as they submit themselves to the Church of Rome with a true Humility and Charity, obeying its Holy Constitutions, and Ceremo-* General Hist.  
of the Isle and  
Kingdom of  
Cyprus. Fol. 71.  
  
Ibid.  
  
Ibid.

*Ceremonies, and wholly conform themselves to her Faith.* And after this manner did they make Heaven and Earth meet, to cause these People to change their Religion.

WE may then I think plainly enough see, that it has not bin the *Latins* Fault, if the *Greeks* have not received their Doctrines, from whence it follows that if it dos appear they have from that time Believed Transubstantiation, and it not appearing they held it before, we may then reasonably conclude, they received it from the *Latins*. This is a Consequence which follows naturally of it self. The Testimony of the *Greeks* cannot be any longer produced as that of the pure *Greeks*, after so many endeavours to make them embrace the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, and the more Mr. *Arnaud* strives to prove the Entercourse of these two Nations, the greater hold he gives us to contest with him the Advantage he pretends to have obtained from hence. But he uses an admirable Expedient, to hinder us from minding this Consequence. For having seen on one hand, that these Histories were too well known, to be passed over wholly in Silence; and on the other, that if he should sincerely produce them as they are in themselves, they would certainly make for our Advantage, as it hath bin already observed; he has thereupon bethought himself, and presented them in another kind of Drefs, whereby he may insensibly turn aside his Readers Minds, and amuse them by an agreeable Diversion. And to this end has thought good to suppose, I denyed the *Greeks* knew what was the Belief of the *Latins*, and to employ all these historical Passages in opposing this *Phantastical Supposition*, that is to say, in manifesting the *Greeks* could not be ignorant of the Belief of the *Latins* touching the *Eucharist*, I shall make appear in its proper place, that this is but a vain Pretence, and a meer quibbling on Words, which he has designedly taken in a Sence contrary to my meaning. Wherefore I here declare it never entred into my Thoughts to deny, what he makes me deny. For this is an Invention he has used on purpose to conceal his indirect dealing.

## C H A P. I I I

*That the Greek Emperors, led by politick Interests, have themselves favoured the Design of the Latins, in Introducing their Doctrines into Greece. Mr. Arnaud's third Artifice discovered.*

**I**T has not bin only the *Latins* that earnestly endeavoured to make the *Greeks* receive their Doctrines. For even the *Grecian* Emperors themselves have favoured this Design; induced by politick Respects, which put them upon seeking the Friendship of the Western Princes, and especially that of the Popes, *who in those times*, as speaks Mr. Arnaud, gave Laws to all the rest; and that even in Temporals. We all know what a great Influence the Inclinations of Princes have, not only on the People, but Ecclesiasticks and Prelates. It is usual with Subjects to turn themselves on that side which is most pleasing to their Sovereign, and there are few Persons who make it not their Business so to do, especially when Princes openly declare their Minds, and make use of their Authority in punishing those that withstand them, and rewarding those that approve them. Now this the *Grecian* Emperours have often particularly done, in favour of the Church of *Rome*, to which they have endeavoured to unite their Subjects.

*POSSEVIN* the Jesuit, reckons up fourteen of these interested Reunions, the *Greeks*, saies he, have bin reunited to us fourteen times, by publick confessions, and have so many times departed from us. And it is certain that as they have ever known the Popes earnest Desires to submit them to the See of *Rome*, so likewise have they not failed to flatter this Desire by fair Promises, when they needed that Churches Assistance, either for the obtaining of some important Design, or for the averting of some dangerous Tempest which threatened them. But as soon as ever these have bin over, they have returned to their first State, and slighted these Reunions. I know not how it hath come to pass that the Popes having bin so often deserved, should still continue so Facile; but perhaps it was not a single Interest, but be it as it will, the Popes have never bin backwards in these Matters.

MY Design is not to set down here all these Reunions, one after another, and relate their particular Circumstances, seeing an Account thereof is to be met with in sundry Historians, but more especially in the Book *Leo Allatus* wrote touching the Agreement of these two Churches. I shall only here take notice of some of them observed by Mr. Arnaud, and which will be sufficient to shew after what manner the *Greek* Emperors have proceeded in Favour of the *Latins*, when they wanted the Pope's Assistance.

*MICHAEL Cerularius* the Patriarch of *Constantinople*, and *Leo* Bishop of *Acrida*, having written some Letters against the Church of *Rome*, to *Peter* the Patriarch of *Antioch*, thereupon caused the *Latine* Churches to be shut up at *Constantinople*. Pope *Leo* the Eleventh was greatly moved at it. He therefore wrote to *Cerularius*, and *Leo* of *Acrida* a long Letter, wherein he answered



answered their Objections, and accused likewise the *Greek Church* of Lightness, Rashness, and Presumption. This hap'ned about the middle of the eleventh Century. The Emperor *Constantin Monomaque* who then Reigned, seeing this Difference, did not stick to take the *Church of Rome's* part: he commanded therefore *Cerularius* to write back to the Pope, Letters of Reconciliation and Peace; and the Pope sends thereupon to *Constantinople* (in order to the Churches Re-union) his Legats, *Humbert*, and *Frederic*, Cardinals, and *Peter*, Arch-Bishop of *Melphus*, with Letters to the Emperor and Patriarch. The Emperor granted to these Legates whatsoever they desired, even to the constraining *Nicetas Pectoratus*, a *Greek Monk*, that had written against the *Romain Church*, to burn publicly his own Book, and anathematise all those that would not acknowledg the Pope's Supremacy, or dared in any wise censure the Doctrines of the *Latins*. This Protection so raised the Legates Courage, that coming into the Patriarchal Church, in the presence of all the People and *Greek Clergy*, they Excommunicated the Patriarch and Bishop of *Acrida*, and all that took their Parts; which raised such a Tumult in *Constantinople*, that the Emperor had much ado to save the Legates from the Popular Fury, who after this returned into *Italy*; whereupon the Patriarch Excommunicated, on his Side, the Legates, and raised the Popes Name out of the *Dptyches*, which are Tables, wherein the Names of those that are prayed for in the Divine Service were set down. Some Authors say, that he Anathematized the Pope, and all the *Latines*, as Heretics; but *Leo Allatius* cites the Testimony of an anonymous Author, by which it appears, that the Emperor hindered, by his Authority this Excommunication. In the time, saies this Author, that *Michael Cerularius* held the See of *Constantinople*, the four Patriarchs raised the Pope's Name out of the *Dptyches*, and yet did they not fully pronounce the Anathema against the *Latines*, being hind'ed by the Emperor, who considered them as a great and mighty Nation, and therefore was afraid of their usual Incursions.

Anonym.  
apud Allat.  
de perp. Conf.  
L. 2. C. 8.

IN the Year 1071, *Michael Parapinacius* was made Emperor, being a Prince that loved his Ease, and therefore withstood not the Turks Progress into *Europe*. He observed the usual Policy of the *Greek Emperors*, which was, to favour the *Latines*; and Mr. Arnaud observes from *Baronius*, and *Leo Allatius*, that Pope *Alexander* the second, sent to him *Peter*, Bishop of *Anagnina*, as his Nuncio. *Allatius* adds that *Peter* remained a Year at *Constantinople*. Which shews us, saies he, This Emperor was in the Communion of the *Roman Church*, and in effect, *Gregory* the seventh Excommunicated, upon his account, *Nicephorus Botoniatus*, who had usurped the Empire, and shut up *Michael* in a Monastery.

L. 2. C. 8.  
P. 173.

Allat. de  
Perp. Conf.  
L. 2. C. 9.

IN the Year 1081 *Nicephorus Botoniatus*, was handled by *Alexis Comnenus*, in the same manner that *Michael* was used by *Nicephorus*, that is to say, he was deprived of the Empire and shut up in a Monastery. But *Alexis* getting into his place, varied not from the Custom of his Predecessors: the necessity of his Affairs obliging him to turn himself on the Side of the *Latins*, more openly than others had done before him, and observe their Measures, altho inwardly he did not affect them. He obstructed their Designs on the Holy Land, as much as in him lay, and hind'ed their Passage thither, obliging them sometimes to turn their Arms against him, and chastize him severely; which caused *Pelavius* the Jesuit, to say, That it was impossible for a man to be more deceitful and unjust than this Emperor was towards the *Latines* in this whole Expedition. Yet had he sent his Embassadors to the Council

Rationar.  
temp. Part 1.  
L. 8. C. 13.  
Baron. ad  
ann. 1095.

of

of *Plaisance* to sollicite the Pope and *Western* Princes to undertake the War against the Infidels. He flattered the *Romain* Church on all Occasions, sending oftentimes Presents to the Monastery of Mount *Cassin*, using likewise the same Liberality towards the other *Latine* Churches, and especially that of St. *Marc* at *Venice*, on which he bestowed considerable Revenues, as 'tis observed by *Allatius*, who alledgeth for this the Testimony of the Princess *Ann* *Allat. de Conf. I. 2. C. 10.* *Comnenus* the Daughter of this Emperor. He likewise gave his helping Hand towards the Essay of a Re-union made at the Synod of *Bary* in the Year 1097. He sent Embassadors to *Rome* in Behalf of Pope *Paschal*, the second who obtained the Papacy, two Years after the Synod of *Bary*, and this Pope in the second Year of his Popedom, sent him the Arch-Bishop of *Milain*. *Baron. ad ann. 1097. Baron. ad ann. 1112 & ad ann. 1118.* *Et solo nomine quod ipse existimo*, saies *Allatius*, *ut si quid erat in Græcia noxium ex Cerularii Schola radicitus extirparet, Græcosque alios contineret in fide.* *Allat. ubi supra.* To the end he might utterly Extirpate, whatsoever remained of Cerularius his Doctrine, and keep the other Greeks in the Faith.

*JOHN Comnenus*, who succeeded *Alexis*, was yet more favourable to the *Latines* than *Alexis*, for this I suppose is the Jesuit *Peteau's* meaning, when he saies that he was, *Patre aliquanto commodior, a little less troublesome than his Father.* I do not observe there has bin any thing more said of him on this Subject, unless, that he received a Letter from *Peter* the Abbot of *Clugny*, in which he entreated him to surrender a Monastery belonging to them of his Order at *Constantinople*, and which had bin taken from them, promising he should participate of all the Merits of that Order, if he re-established them. *Baronius* saies likewise that *Anaclet* the Antypope to *Innocent* the second, wrote to this Emperor, informing him of his Promotion to the Popedom; and that he called him his most dear Son. *Baron. ad ann. 1130.*

AFTER *John* succeeded *Manuel Comnenus*, a Prince very much addicted to Dissimulation and double Dealing, who on one hand did the *Latines* all the Mischief he privately could, by the Secret Intelligence he held with the *Sarracens*, and on the other, earnestly endeavoured at a compliance with the Desires of the Church of *Rome*, touching the Re-union of the *Greeks*. *Allatius* tells us, that he sent Embassadors to Pope *Alexander* the third, to treat with him concerning this Re-union, and that the Pope sent *John* the Sub-Deacon of the Church of *Rome*, to *Constantinople*, to reduce the *Greeks* by his Sermons. He likewise tells us, 'twas this Emperor that obliged *Hugo Eterianus* to write against the *Greeks*, touching the Procession of the Holy Ghost; that the Emperess his Wife (as Mr. *Arnaud* himself observes) after him, was a *Germain* and of the *Romish* Religion: and that he bestowed great Gifts on the *Latine* Churches: whereupon the *Latine* Bishops for an acknowledgment of his Munificence, set up his Image in their Churches. It is difficult to Imagine how a Prince who in his Heart so greatly hated the *Latines*, that the Jesuit *Peteau* has not stuck thereupon to call him, *hominem subdolum & Christianis rebus quæ ad Latinos spectabant infestum & iniquum adeo, ut cum Saracenis in eorum conspiraret exitium*, that is to say, a Person so deceitful and cruel to the *Latine* Church, that he conspired its Ruine, together with the *Saracens*, yet should favour the *Latins* in his Empire, and endeavour to procure the Re-union of its Church with the *Roman*. But *Allatius* unties the Knot, by shewing us in the Acts of *Alexander* the third, that the Design of this Emperor was so to bring it about, that the Pope who was at Variance with the Emperor *Frederick*, should take away from him the *Latin* Empire, and render it to the *Greeks*, to whom *Manuel* affirmed it did justly belong: *Allat. ubi supra.* *Ration. Temp. Part I. C. 8. C. 21.*

belong: and for this Effect he sent Embassadors to the Pope; and the Pope sent back together with his Embassadors the Bishop of *Ostia*, to negotiate this Affair at *Constantinople*. Howsoever it was, it sufficiently appears that all these different Interests yielded the *Latins* fit Opportunities to plant their Doctrines amongst the *Greeks*.

Allat. de  
Perp. Conf.  
L. 2. C. 2.  
Idem. Ibid.

*EMANUEL'S* Intrigue was so far carried on, that he assembled a Council at *Constantinople*, where the Reunion of the Churches was proposed. Some say, the *Latins* required no more of the *Greeks*, but the Acknowledgment of the Popes Authority, the grant of Appeals, and the Commemoration of him in the publick Prayers of their Church: Others say, the *Latins* would have intirely subjected the *Greeks* to their Wills and Customs. That which is certain is, they could not Agree, and that the Emperor himself lent his helping Hand to separate them, yet not daring to Anathematise the *Latins*, because, saies a Greek Author, Cited by *Allatius*, they were a great and famous People.

Ancyran.  
apud Allat.  
Ibid.

L. 3. C. 2.

AFTER the *Latins* had established their Empire at *Constantinople*, the *Greeks* withdrew into *Asia*, where they chose an Emperor and Patriarch, and the Affairs of the *Latins* falling to decay, there was an after Tryal made upon the *Greeks*, touching a Reunion. Mr. *Arnaud* observes, that the Pope wrote about it to *Germain* the Patriarch of *Constantinople*, and 'tis very likely he forgot not to sollicite the Emperor, who was then *Fohn Ducas*. He sent two *Dominicans*, and two *Franciscans*, who caused an Assembly to be called for this Effect, but to no purpose. For each of them had his particular Interest and Design in this Affair.

Mat. Par. in  
Henrico. 3.

THE Pope intended to subject the *Greek Church* to himself, and the Emperor endeavoured to hinder the Pope from favouring the *Latins*, who held *Constantinople*, and to Regain this City, as the *Greeks* did some time after; *Mathew Paris* gives an account of these Letters of the Patriarch to the Pope, and of the Popes to the Patriarch, concerning this Negotiation.

Raynald. ad  
ann. 1256.  
numb. 47.

*THEODORUS Lascaris* succeeded *Fohn Ducas*, in the Year 1255. Pope *Alexander* the fourth fail'd not to sollicite him to a Reunion: he sent him an expresse Legate for that purpose; but this Emperor soon died, whereupon this Affair was no farther prosecuted.

Allat. de  
Conf. Perp.  
L. 2. C. 14.

*ALLATIUS* observes there was then a *Greek Patriarch*, Named *Blemmida*, who was a Learned Man, and very Zealous for this Union with the *Latins*.

L. 5. C. 1.  
P. 255.

*MICHAEL Paleologus*, obtaining the Empire, and having a while after made himself Master of *Constantinople*, endeavoured above all others at a Reunion with the *Latines*, Mr. *Arnaud* acknowledges, that having united himself to the Church of Rome, he forced, by all manner of Severity, the Bishops and Religious *Greeks* to do the same. This Prince Contracted a particular Friendship with *Gregory* the Tenth, before he came to the Popedom, according to *Allatius*, which gave him the greater Facility to Negotiate with the Church of Rome. He sent several times his Embassadors, and the Pope his Legates in order to a Reconciliation. He held several Councils on this Occasion, and Inflicted the greatest Torments on those that had the Courage to re-

Allat. de  
Perp. Conf.  
L. 2. C. 15.  
Ibid.

sist



first him, and promoted others who embraced this Union; these are *Allatius* his own Words. He falsely accused *Fohn Vccus*, Treasurer to the Church of Constantinople, and caused him to be Imprisoned; because *Vccus* had said in his hearing, *that altho the Latines were not respected as Hereticks, yet were they such nevertheless*; which so greatly provoked this Emperor, as caused him to think of nothing but Revenge; And for as much as *Vccus* had sheltered himself in the Temple of St. *Sophia*, and the Emperor daring not to Violate this *Aylum*, he wrote to him very kind Letters, intreating him to come to him, which *Vccus* had no sooner endeavoured, but was apprehended, and carried to the Tower, where he was solicited to joyn with the *Latins*.

*Pachymer. Hist. Lab. 3. C. 11.*

*Idem C. 13.*

THIS Prince made and unmade Patriarchs at his Will, *he usurped*, saies the Historian *Raynaldus*, the Ecclesiastical Authority, placing and displacing Patriarchs at his Pleasure. He first of all constrain'd *Arsenius* to resign up his place to *Nicephorus*; and after the taking of Constantinople, he recalled the same *Arsenius*, who had excommunicated him, for what he had done against *Fohn Lascaris* the Son of *Theodorus*, to whom the Empire did of Right belong; and whose Eyes he had caused to be put out; and seeing he could not prevail on this Patriarch, he raised up false Witnesses against him, and caused him to be deposed in a Synod, and *Germain* chosen in his place. *Germain* not being futable to his Humour, he so far prevailed with him as to obtain a voluntary Resignation to *Foseph*; but *Foseph* not consenting to the Reunion with the *Latins*, nor the sending of Deputies to the Pope, with whom the Emperor had charged them to conclude this Affair, he caused him therefore to retire into a Covent, upon Condition that if this Matter broke off, he should enter again into his charge of Patriarch. Now the Deputies being returned with the News of the Reunion accomplished, the Emperor chose this same above named *Fohn Vccus*, who at length suffered himself to be won, either by the reading of some Books put into his Hands, or by the Miseries he had suffered during a long Imprisonment, and hope of a contrary Usage: Yet *Vccus* did not please him long.

*Raynald. ad ann. 1261. Num. 3. Vide. Pach.*

IT would be a difficult matter to relate here all the Violences and Cruelties of *Michael*, against those that withstood the Reunion of the two Churches. It will be sufficient to relate here two or three of them, by which we may judge of the rest. He Imprisoned *Holobulus Rhetor* of the Church of Constantinople, whose Office, according to *Codinus*, was to Interpret the Holy Scriptures, and caused him to be cruelly Scourged, and at length a Rope to be fastned about his Neck, and to be thus exposed thro out all the City, with his Wife and Neece, together with ten others, bound after the same manner, causing the two former of these to be flapt ever and anon on the Cheeks, with the Entrails of a Sheep, which is amongst the *Greeks*, a kind of Infamous Punishment, wherewith only the Vilest Offenders are treated, and those who add Obstinacy to the Crimes of which they have bin Guilty. He likewise Imprisoned four of the Chief Officers of his House, two of which were his Kinsmen, and there kept them a long time laden with Irons. This Severity seemed very great, but not content therewith; when the Pope sent Legates to Constantinople, to Confirm the *Greeks* in their Obedience to him, he made them Witnesses of his Cruelty towards the Opposers of this Union, commanding a certain Bishop of *Ephesus*, to conduct them to the Prison, and shew them these four Persons, who were of the chiefest Rank in *Greece*, they were in a square Room, each of 'em chained

*Pachymer. L. 5. C. 10 Codin. de Officiis Const. Cap. 1.*

*Idem. l. 6. C. 15.*

to a corner thereof, and laden with Irons, and that which was an Aggravation of their Misery, was to be thus exposed a Spectacle to their Enemies.

Idem. L. 3.  
C. 18.

Raynald. ad  
ann. 1162.  
num. 3. &c. ad  
ann. 1162.

Raynald. ad  
ann. 1163.  
num. 22.

L. 3. C. 2.  
P. 266.

WOULD we know the Motives inducing this Prince to use so great Severity in this matter. Observe we then what *Pachymerus* tells us. *He sent oftentimes Embassadors to the Pope, and endeavoured to gain him by Presents. For he plainly perceived the Danger lay on that side, and that the Italians could not lye long Idle; Wherefore he made Proposals of Union, to the end he might be secure as to them, and the better Dispose of his other Affairs. These Embassies then were frequent, and the Presents Magnificent, not only to the Pope, but likewise to several Cardinals, and others whom he judged powerful in the Court of Rome.* In effect as soon as ever Pope *Urbain* the fourth, received the News of the re-taking of *Constantinople*, and the Progress of the *Greeks*, he earnestly endeavoured to stir up the Princes and People to assist the *Latins*; he wrote for this Effect, to the Fryar *Minorites* in *France*, and enjoyned them to Preach a *Croisado* on this occasion, with the same Indulgences which had bin granted them that undertook the Holy War; he wrote likewise to King *Levis* upon the same account; and threatened the *Genoises* who favoured *Michael*, (being at Varyance with the *Venetians*) that if they forsook not his Allyance, he would excommunicate them, he wrote to the Prelates of *England* and *France*, exhorting them to contribute to this War, in short he forgot nothing he judged necessary in this Occasion. *Michael* then seeing that the only means to shelter himself from this Storm, was to fly to the usual Policy of the *Greeks*, that is to say, to negotiate the Re-union of the two Churches; he thereupon wrote to the Pope, Letters full of Respect and Affection to the Roman Church, and having received such an Answer as he desired, he earnestly applied himself to this Business. Mr. *Arnaud* himself is agreed on the Motives which set this Emperor at work. *Foreseeing*, saies he, *the Popes would not fail to arm the Western Princes against him, and that he had a potent Enemy, in the Person of Charles D'Anjou, King of Naples, and Sicily, with whom the Emperor Baldwin, being driven from Constantinople was allyed, he resolved thereupon to reunite the Greeks with the Roman Church, that he might by this means deliver himself from the fear of those dreadful Croisado's, which made the Greek Emperors tremble at that time in Constantinople, the Sultans in Babylon and Grand Caire, and the Tartars themselves as far as Persia.* It is certain, adds he, that this Re-union was carried on upon politick Respects.

L. 3. C. 3.  
P. 274.

Pachym. L. 6.  
C. 15.

AND these in effect were the true Reasons of *Michael's* Undertakings; which being his greatest Interest, he therefore left no means unattempted whereby to accomplish it. Which Mr. *Arnaud* does still grant; *We may read*, saies he, *in Pachymerus, that he endeavoured too violently, to bring the Bishops over to his Will.* But did he not acknowledg it, we need only read what *Michael* himself saies in his harangue to the *Greek* Clergy, assembled upon this Occasion. *I must acknowledg*, saies he, *that I have sisted with- in me the most tender Sentiments of Nature, to accomplish my design. You know I loved a Person, with the same tenderness and Respect, as if he had been my own Father, and I believed I lov'd him more than my Father, seeing he gave me the Communion, and received me into the Bosom of the Church, which I esteem more than the giving me Life, and yet have I Sacrificed him to this Interest. 'Tis the Patriarch Joseph I mean. I have violently handled several others, even my intimate Friends, and oppressed divers among your selves. I have moreover several*

*several of my near Kinsmen in Prison, there having bin no other Reason for their opposing me, or my punishing them, than only this Re-union with the Latins. I think this is sufficient to Convince us, that this Emperor abused his Power in Favour of the Court of Rome.*

I confess those that succeeded him, altho they had the same Opinion touching the Re-union, yet used not the same Extremities, nevertheless *Fohn Paleologus* endeavoured earnestly to effect this, and therefore went in Person to Rome in great Pomp, to make his Declaration.

*EMANUEL* the second who succeeded him, trod in the same Steps, addressing himself to Pope *Boniface* the ninth, who published a *Croisado* for his Assistance against the *Turks*; and a while after, he treated with *Martin* the fifth, touching the Reconciliation of the two Churches. In Fine, *Fohn* the seventh, *Paleologus* came to the Council of *Florence*, and sent his Clergy thither on the same Design.

*Syrop. Hist. Concil. Flor. Sc. B. 2. C. 5.*

WE may then well conclude the *Latins* wanted not Opportunities to introduce their Religion amongst the *Greeks*. For first it is not to be supposed but that this great Passion these Emperors shewed towards this Union, inclined the Minds and Hearts of several Persons, as well of the Clergy as Laity to favour the *Roman* Church, to embrace its Interests, and accommodate themselves to its Doctrine. We all know how weak and fickle the greatest part of mankind are, they approve and esteem whatsoever is in Favour and Credit, there being few whose Minds are not Byassed even in Religious matters, by temporal Advantages. Men commonly in such cases endeavour to Mollify and take in a good Sence, that which before was a Subject of Scandal: they enlarge or diminish Objects, to bring 'em to the Point they desire; they hearken to nothing but what is pleasing, and behold whatsoever opposes their Interest in such a manner as shall be sure to render it unjust and odious.

IN the second place, we need not doubt but this same Passion of the Emperors obliged several others to manage these Controversies, and let go divers Articles as being but of small Importance. *All the Schismatical Greeks, saies Allatius, are not like minded towards the Latins; some of them are more moderate than others, making the Difference consist only in one or two Points; others more Rigorous, for whatsoever the Latins do, which agrees not with the Ceremonies and Rites of the Greeks, they Condemn and Reject, as an Abomination.* He Confirms afterwards what he saies, by a Passage taken out of *Demetrins Comatenus*, which tells us, *that several moderate Greeks, agreed with the Latins in divers Particulars, acknowledging the proud and fierce Humor of their Nation, which hath almost become Barbarous by their frequent Commerce with the Barbarians, and that these aforementioned have only stuck at the single Article touching the Procession of the Holy Ghost.* Mr. *Arnaud* himself saies, *'twas observed the Greeks were of different Dispositions in those times ( he means in the twelfth Century ) for some of 'em maintained the Latins ought to be treated as Hereticks, and others blamed these Transports of Passion.* But 'tis certain even the most rigorous amongst them, only stuck to those Points which were openly debated by the two Churches, amongst which the Principal were touching the Procession of the Holy Ghost, and the *Azymes*. The Constancy they shewed in Reference to these Articles, sufficiently exposed them to the Hatred and ill Usage of their Emperors, so that we need not descend

*De Perp. Conf. L. 3. C. 12.*

*L. 2. C. 10. P. 100.*



descend to the Examination of other Particulars, which broke not out into Disputes on either side.

NEITHER need we any more doubt but that several condescended to the Will of their Emperors, upon this Consideration, that altho they were Reunited to the Church of *Rome*, yet should they suffer no Alteration, either in the essential Parts of their Religion, or Ceremonies, and that there was no hurt in cheating these *Latins*, by this Fancy of a Union, which signified nothing at th' bottom, but which yet would yield them great Advantage in their Affairs. And this was the chief Reason which *Michael Paleologus* offered to his Clergy, according to *Pachymerus* his Relation, he shewed them, *saies he, that the only Cause moving him to procure this Peace with the Latine Church, was to hinder those Cruel and Bloody Wars which threatned them, and to spare his Subjects Blood. That as to the rest, they might assure themselves, that after the Reunion, their Church should remain as it was, without any Innovation? That he himself would take care of it. That the whole Reconciliation with the Church of Rome, might be reduced to these three Articles, viz. The Primacy, Appeal, and Commemoration, all which signified nothing, if rightly considered. For when, saies he, will the Pope come to Constantinople, to take Possession of this Primacy! who will make Appeals, to end them in so far a Country, who will Cross the Seas for this. And as to the Commemoration of the Pope in our Patriarchal Temple, and your other great Temple, (when the Patriarch shall Officiate there,) being prudent as you are, can this appear such a strange thing to you. Do you not know the Fathers have often made use of Dispensations, and frequently submitted themselves for the publick Good. Pachymerus adds, that there were some in effect who let go these two Articles touching the Primacy, and Appeals, upon this Consideration, that the Pope would have only the Name and Shadow of the thing, but never enjoy the thing it self.*

BUT in fine, we need not question, but this Carriage of the Emperors, much encouraged and imboldned the *Latins*, to endeavour effectually to insinuate their Opinions into the Minds of both Clergy and Laity, under pretence of instructing, and making them capable of this Union. We know what a Religious Zeal can do, and especially when 'tis countenanced by Power, and seconded by hopes of Success. Had the *Greek Church* remained but some Years in this Condition, it might be said, that these have bin but slight and transient Attempts, which have not had time to produce any great Effects. But 'tis certain that since the eleventh Century, which is to say, since the time *Berengarius* was last Condemned, till now, she has bin continually as it were under the *Roman Yoke*, and they have had all desirable Opportunities to introduce their Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*; and 'tis a kind of Miracle if they have not obtained their Ends. For when men have had to do with an ignorant and gross People, in matters of Religion, as the *Greeks* are, and have bin for a long time, when Persons have had a familiar and ordinary Commerce with them, and have besides all proper means to prevail on them, as Power, Authority, Mildness, the way of Instruction, Fear, Hope, and moreover upheld by the Emperors, Patriarchs, and Bishops; it is so far from being difficult to do what one will, that 'tis on the contrary very difficult not to do it. Whence it follows, that even when Mr. *Arnaud* should make it appear that *Transubstantiation*, and the Adoration of the *Eucharist*, have bin established amongst the *Greeks* since the eleventh Century, his Proofs would be useless and of no Consequence, as

to our Debate; for it might always be answered, that this Doctrine hath bin communicated to them by the *Latins*, and the ways of this Communication are not hard to be understood. Mr. *Arnaud* has bin very sensible of the truth of what I say, and therefore was willing to relate, himself the greatest part of these Historical Passages I mentioned: But he has otherwise represented them, to the end he might draw fruitless and impertinent Conclusions from them, and by this means hinder us from making a just and right use of them. This Deceit of his, is like to that he has us'd in the foregoing Chapter.

WE shall in the ensuing part of this Discourse, overthrow his pretended Consequences. It may suffice at present to observe the Circuit he has taken, on purpose to divert his Reader from discovering the real Truth. For I do not believe there is any rational Man but will judge, that seeing these Doctrines appeared not in the *Greek Church*, before these Disorders; if they should appear afterwards, they must be introduced by them. This is a natural and plain Conclusion.

## CHAP. IV.

*That the Monks and other Emissaries, with which the Eastern Countries have bin for a long time Replenished, do Invalidate the Proof taken from the Belief of these People. Mr. Arnaud's fourth Deceit laid open.*

**M**R. *Arnaud's* fourth Artifice consists in concealing from us, the Care taken for several Ages, to fill *Greece, Asia, Egypt, Ethiopia, the Indias*, and in a word, all the Countries wherein there's any People professing Christianity, with Religious, and other Ecclesiastical Persons, sent expressly to plant the *Roman* Religion, and even to establish fixt Seminaries, who are charged to use their utmost Endeavours to instruct and Reduce these Schismatics. This Artifice of his, is not of small Importance: for he thereby deprives us of the Knowledge of several Particulars; without which 'tis impossible to make a true and right Judgment of this Controversie. And in truth we have reason to admire Mr. *Arnaud's* Ingenuity. For when there are any Historical Passages which seem to favour us, if they are so publickly known that 'twill be to no purpose to conceal them, he then produces them, but in so doing, applies them to other matters, on purpose to make us lose the Consequence may be drawn from them: and on the other hand, if they are Passages less known, and that he may well conceal them; he then either not mentions them, or but lightly touches on them, to the end they may not be thoroughly considered. He has taken this last course in what concerns the Missions. Having prudently foreseen that this Mystery could not be handled without discovering at the same time the weakness and folly of his Proofs drawn from the Schismatical Churches; he has therefore thought good to make no mention of them, or

if at all, so slightly that they could scarcely be taken Notice of, lest he should be charged with discovering the Secret, and overthrowing himself, what he has taken upon him to defend. But seeing he has no reason to expect his Silence should set Bounds to mens Curiosity; and that they must know no more but what he tells them, so he must not take it ill, if I relate what he would have concealed.

I say then, that since the *Latins* Conquered the Holy Land, and made 'em selves Masters of the *Grecian* Empire, all *Greece* and other *Eastern* Nations, have bin filled with Monks, or Emissaries, whose only design and employment has bin to Insinuate the Doctrines and Customs of the Church of *Rome* in those Countries. Mr. *Arnaud*, who commonly takes things in the worst Sence, will be sure to tell me I am to blame, in blaming this Design; Seeing it is an effect of that Zeal the *Latins* have ever shewed for their Religion, it being usual with Persons who are perswaded of the Truth of their own Faith, to do all they can, to make Schismaticks, and Heretical People to Embrace the same. To which I answer, I do not at all blame the Endeavours of the *Roman* Church, to win these People. Seeing she believes they are in an Error, and therefore would undeceive them, and so far is Christianly and Charitably done; but as to those artificial Means the Emissaries use, which favour so much of worldly Policy, they are in no wise to be commended. I do not, I say, blame them of the Church of *Rome* for labouring to propagate their Faith; seeing they believe there is no Salvation out of their Communion.

YET I cannot bear with Mr. *Arnaud*, who knows full well, what the Monks and Emissaries have done, and do still in the *East*. That he I say should attempt to prove the *Perpetuity* of the Doctrines of the *Roman* Church by this Reason, That they are to be found established amongst these People. For seeing their Conversion has bin endeavoured time out of mind, no means having bin left untried to effect this; how then can it be affirmed that if at this Day they Believe Transubstantiation, this Doctrine hath bin received by them, at the same time when Christianity was first planted amongst them? Who sees not the Absurdity of this Consequence? Let the Business of the Emissaries be termed a Reduction, Instruction, Conversion, or what else he please? Yet would I by no means have Mr. *Arnaud* attempt the perswading us, That if the *Greeks* and other *Eastern* Christians, for whose sake the Emissaries have taken such Pains, do believe Transubstantiation, it thereupon follows that this Doctrine has bin ever held by those Churches, for this is a way of Arguing, which will never prevail on rational Men. For any Mans Reason will tell him, that if these People believe Transubstantiation, 'tis because the Emissaries have taught it them, unless it be shewed that they held this Doctrine before they came amongst them. And this is the Contents of this Chapter. The Consequence I pretend to draw hence, is clear enough in it self, and we need no more but only represent what I already hinted touching the Employment of the Monks, and Emissaries in the Levant.

FIRST then, it is evident, that after the Conquest of the Holy Land, both *Palestine*, and *Syria* were filled with Monks of every Order. Mr. *Arnaud* himself acknowledges it, and thereupon alledgeth the Testimony of *James de Vitry*, who tells us, that multitudes of People resorted from all parts of the World, to the Holy Land, being allured thither by the Odour of those Venerable



merable and Holy Places, where they repaired the decayed Churches, Built new ones, and founded Monasteries in several Places, by the Liberality of Princes. In effect *William of Tyre* makes mention of several Abbots and Priors, who were present at the Councils held at *Napolis*, a City of *Samarina*, and at *Antioch*. He likewise remarks some who signed the Articles of Agreement made between the *Venetians*, and Patriarch of *Jerusalem*. Mr. *Arnaud* himself saies, there were built Monasteries of the Order of Cister Monks, together with others of *St. Norbet*, and *St. Bennet*, in several Commodious Places.

*Guill. Tyr.*  
L. 12. C. 17.  
L. 15. C. 16.  
L. 12. C. 25.

NEITHER need we any more doubt, but after the *Latins* had made themselves Masters of *Greece*, the Monks dispersed themselves over all the parts thereof, to which Mr. *Arnaud* consents, and tells us, That *Greece* was filled with *Dominicans* and *Fryar Minorites*, that is to say, *Inquisitors* who had often performed this Office, in *France* and *Germany*. He farther saies, that the Pope had given them in Charge to confer with the *Greeks*, and examine their Doctrine; which is not a difficult matter to believe.

IN the Year 1177 according to *Baronius*, Pope *Alexander* the third sent a certain Physician, called *Phillip* into *Ethiopia*, to convert the Christians of that Country, and Instruct them in the *Romish* Religion.

*Baron. ad ann.*  
1177.

NOT long after, *Innocent* the third obtained the Popedom, and immediately effectually endeavoured to bring the Hereticks and Schismaticks over to the *Roman Church*. And sent for this Purpose *Fohn*, and *Simon*, into *Dioecia* and *Dalmatia*, and some others into *Bulgaria*, *Albertus*, and *Albertinus*, to *Constantinople*, and the Arch Bishop of *Mayence*, into *Armenia*.

*Raynald. ad ann.*  
1192.  
num. 55.

GREGORY the ninth his Successor, continued the same Design. *Raynaldus* Reports in his time, all *Asia* was full of Religious, who went up and down, Preaching from place to place. He produces likewise a Letter from a Dominican named *Philip*, which he wrote to the Pope, in which he gives him an account of the Progress he made in the Conversion of the Patriarch of the Eastern *Jacobites*, of two Arch Bishops, one a *Jacobite*, and the other a *Nestorian*, of the Conversion of the Patriarch of the *Nestorians*, and of another Patriarch of the *Jacobites* in *Egypt*. He added farther that all these Nations, viz. the Christians of *Chaldea*, *Media*, *Persia*, *Armenia*, *Syria*, *Phenicia*, *India*, *Ethiopia*, *Libya*, and *Egypt*, yielded themselves to their Exhortations, there remaining none but the *Greeks* that persevered in their Malice, and who every where withstood the Doctrine of the *Roman Church*, either privately or openly, in blaspheming all its Sacraments.

*Raynald. ad ann.*  
1193.

INNOCENT the fourth who succeeded *Gregory*, wrote to the Prince of *Bulgaria*, Solliciting him to embrace the Religion of the *Latins*, and for this effect sent him several Monks and Fryars, entreating him to give them a favourable Hearing. In the Year 1246 he sent Fryar *Ascelinus*, *Simon* of *St. Quentin*, *Alexander*, and *Albertus* of the Order of Preachers, and *Fohn du plan Carpin*, with Fryar *Bennet* a *Polander*, of *St. Francis's* Order, to the *Tartars*, to perswade them to receive the Christian Faith; they passed thro *Russia*, and delivered to Duke *Daniel*, to *Basil* his Brother, and the Bishops of that Country the Popes Letters, which conjured them, to forsake the *Greek* Religion which they professed, and unite themselves to the *Roman Church*; they likewise endeavoured with all their Power to effect this, and the Success of their Negotiation was, that the *Russians* sent Deputies to *Opizon*, who

*Raynald. ad ann.*  
1245.  
num. 11.

*Fohn du Plan's Voy.*  
age C. 9. &  
C. 24.

who was then the Popes Legate in *Poland*, offering to submit themselves to the *Roman Church*, provided the Pope would raise their Countries into a Kingdom, and bestow the regal Crown on their Duke. *Opizon* gladly received them, and granted what they demanded. The Pope sent the Arch Bishop of *Prussia* in quality of a Legate, and ordered for their Instruction in the *Romish Religion*, a Mission made up of as many Secular Priests, as *Religions*, of the Order of *Preachers*, and Fryar *Minorites*, amongst whom there was chosen a certain Preaching Fryar named *Alexius*, who was particularly to attend the Prince. The Arch Bishop of *Prussia* reconciled King *Daniel*, his Brother *Basil*, who was King of *Landemirie*, and likewise their People to the Church of *Rome*.

*Raynald. ad ann. 1247. num. 30. & ad ann. 1253. num. 38.* BUT whilst *Innocent*, endeavoured the Conversion of the *Russians*, he neglected not the rest of the Christians in the *East*. He earnestly laboured, saies *Raynaldus*, to Reduce those People, how far distant soever they were, and for this purpose sent them several Religions, who were Learned and Zealous for the propagating of the Faith, whom he honoured with the Title of *Apostolical Legates*. He farther saies, that he gave to *Lawrence* his Penitentiary a large Commission, for the same purpose, injoyning him to take care of *Armenia*, *Iconia*, *Turky*, *Greece*, *Babylon*, and endeavour to gain the *Greeks*, who were in the Patriarchate of *Antioch*, *Jerusalem*, and Kingdom of *Cyprus*, as well as the *Jacobites*, *Maronites*, and *Nestorians*.

*Voyage of Rubriq. C. 1. &c.* IN the Year 1253, the foresaid *Innocent* the fourth, sent *William de Rubruquis*, and *Bartholomew de Cremona*, who were of the Order of Fryar *Minorites*, into *Tartaria*, where they found several Christians of the *Greek* and *Nestorian Religion*, for the Reduction of whom they laboured with all their Power.

*Raynald. ad ann. 1264. num. 64. & 65.* *URBAN* the fourth imitating in this his Predecessors, sent in the Year 1264 *Nicholas* Bishop of *Crotonia*, with *Gerard* and *Rayner*, Monks of the Order of Fryar *Minorites*, to *Michael Paleologus* the *Grecian* Emperor, who had re-taken *Constantinople*, To the end, saies *Raynaldus*, he might be instructed together with his People, in the *Orthodox Religion*. It appears by the Letters of *Clement* his Successor, that *Urbain*, sent moreover other Monks to *Constantinople*, on the same Design, to wit, *Simon*, *Peter de Moras*, *Peter de Crista*; and *Boniface*, and *Clement* sent *Dominicans*.

*Idem. ad ann. 1276. num. 45. & ad ann. 1277. num. 20. 21.* IN the Year 1276, two Bishops, and two preaching Fryars went into *Greece*, by order of Pope *Innocent* the twenty first; to instruct farther the *Greeks*, and confirm them in Obedience to the *Roman See*, to which the Emperor *Michael Paleologus* had obliged them to submit themselves.

*Idem. ad ann. 1278. num. 17. 18. &c.* A little while after, there was another Mission of Fryar *Minorites* to the *Tartars*, to instruct them more fully in the Articles of the *Roman Faith*, who had embraced the Christian Religion. This was in the Year 1278, under Pope *Nicholas* the third.

*Idem. ad ann. 1288. num. 29. 30. 31. Ibid. num. 32.* TOWARDS the end of this Century, *Nicholas* the fourth sent others after the same manner, for the Reduction of those People who professed the *Greek Religion*. *Raynaldus* tells us, that this Pope made use of *Dominicans* particularly for this purpose, and sent them to preach thro out all the *East*, in *Greece*, *Bulgaria*, *Valachia*, to the *Syrians*, *Iberians*, *Allains*, *Russians*, *Jacobites*,

*bites, Ethiopians, Nestorians, Georgians, Armenians, Indians, to the Tartarian Christians, and generally to all strange Nations, separated from the Roman Church. And for this purpose, he likewise made use of the Fryar Minorites, of whose Order he had bin himself, that he sent to several Eastern Bishops a Summary of the Christian Faith, according to which he would have the People instructed; and earnestly recommended his Emissaries to Kings and Princes, to the end that being respected by them, their Labours might be the more Effectual.*

*BONIFACE* the eighth, renewed these general Missions into the *East*, and to encourage them the more, to acquit themselves well in their Employ, he augmented their Priviledges after a very considerable manner. This was in the Year 1299; These continued under the following Popes, as it appears by the Letters that *John* the twenty second sent them, in the Year 1318, wherein he gives God thanks for the Progress the Fryar *Predicants* had made; and exhorted them to continue there. The same appears by other Letters, of *Gregory* the eleventh towards the end of the fourteenth Century.

THERE are likewise two other Relations of the Voyages of two *Dominicans*, one named Brother *Bieul*, the other Brother *Oderick*, who went by the Popes Command to preach in the *East*. The first of these does not set down the time, but I suppose 'twas about the fourteenth Century, for therein is mention made of the Death of *Argon* King of the *Tartars*, which hap'ned towards the end of the thirteenth Century. The second bears date 1330. It appears by the first of these, that there was at that time Houses of *Dominican* Fryars, set up in *Asia*, for the Conversion of the Schismaticks. *We came directly*, saies this Author, *to the stately City of Baudas, where the Fryar Predicants of our Order who dwelt there, came out to meet us, Receiving us with great Joy.* And by the second, it appears likewise, that the Emissaries of the Order of Fryar *Minorites*, had already gotten as far as the *Indias*, for there is Mention made of three Fryars, who after a long Dispute against the *Nestorians*, were put to Death for speaking against *Mahomet*.

IN the Year 1369, *Urban* the fifth sent Fryar *Minorites*, amongst all these Nations, with the same order to Preach, and propagate the Catholick Faith. He sent likewise four Bishops into *Albania* and the neighbouring Provinces, to reduce these Schismatical People to his Obedience. He took the same Care for the Instruction of the *Russians, Moldavians, and Valaquians*, to whom he sent twenty five Religious of the Order of Fryar *Minorites*. *Anthony* Bishop of *Mileve* was ordered to instruct the *Georgians*, and other *Eastern* Christians, together with twenty five other Monks, who were joyned to him. Under *Gregory* the eleventh, there were several Convents Founded in *Bosnia, Bascia*, for the same Design of Converting the Schismaticks. This Pope enlarged the Priviledges of the *Eastern* Missionaries, on Condition they would remain in those Countries, and not return into the *West*, under Penalty of being deprived of all their Priviledges.

IN the fifteenth Century, *Martin* the fifth took Care again of the Missions, which had bin in some sort Interrupted during the Troubles of that great Schisme, which began under *Urban* the sixth, in the Year 1378, and which ended not till after the Council of *Constance* in the Year 1414, wherein *Martin* was chosen. He made the King of *Poland* his Vicar, thro out the whole Extent of his Dominions, to the end he should endeavour the Reduction



duction of the *Greeks*, giving him for this purpose full Authority over the Ecclesiasticks and Monks. He conferred the same Power on the Duke of *Lithuania*, giving him an exprefs Charge to endeavour to propagate the Catholick Religion.

*EUGENUS* the fourth, *Martin's* Successor, set forth a new Mission, which consisted of twenty Religious of the Order of Fryar *Minorites*, together with a Bishop, whom he sent into *Asia*, for the propagating of the *Roman* Faith, and the particular Instruction of the Christians that dwelt in the *Caspian* Mountains. He employed *Gregory* Arch Bishop of *Moldoblachie*, who was a Latinized *Greek*, for the Reduction of the *Bulgarians*, *Valaquians*, *Moldavians*, enjoying him to apply himself thereunto with all possible Care and Diligence. He sent *Andrew* Arch Bishop of *Colossia* into *Cyprus*, to bring back to his Obedience, the Christians of different Sects who inhabited this Island, namely the *Nestorians*, *Armenians*, *Coptics*, *Chaldeans*, *Facobites*, together with the *Greeks* who were the Natives of that place.

IN the sixteenth Century the *Portugaisers* having settled themselves in the *East Indias*, it is well known they established Missions and Seminaries in divers places, and earnestly endeavoured to instruct the *Ethiopians*, *Nestorians*, and other Christian Sects which are in that Country.

*LEO* the tenth sent several to instruct the *Russians* and *Muscovites*, he took the same Care for the *Abyssians*, and *Maronites*; for these last, altho they had submitted to the *Roman* Church, yet retained their antient Errors.

*CLEMENT* the seventh received an Ambassador from *Basil*, Duke of *Muscovia*, and sent to this Duke a Legate to treat concerning his Reunion to the Church of *Rome*. This was in the Year 1531, according to *Spondanus*, *Raynaldus* refers it to the Year 1525.

IN fine, if we would know the present State of all the *East* in this Respect, 'tis but considering that the Emissaries have so far overspread these Countries, that scarcely is there any place where they have not settled themselves, and wherein they do not exert all their Learning and Industry, not for the Conversion of the Infidels, for this they cannot expect, but for the gaining of these Schismatics, insinuating the *Roman* Religion amongst these Ignorant and Dull People, who still profess Christianity.

*EUGENIUS* Roger, a Recollet who was sent into *Barbary*, in his Description of the Holy Land, tells us, That those of his Order have maintained themselves in *Palestine*, from the Year 1333; to this present, and have two Convents at *Jerusalem*, one at *Bethlem*, one at *Nazareth*, one at *Rama*, one at *St. John of Acra*, one at *Sydon*, six in *Aegypt*, two in the Isle of *Cyprus*, one at *Aleppo*, one at *Damascus*, two at *Mount Libanus*, one at *Alexandria*, and one at *Constantinople*.

*JOSEPH* Besson the Jesuit, in his Holy Syria, tells us, that the Society have five Seminaries in *Syria*, to wit, at *Tripoly*, *Sidon*, *Damascus*, *Aleppo*, and at *Questroan*, which have bin settled there since the Year 1625, and sent over by the Order of *Urbain* the eighth.

FRANCIS

*FRANCIS Richard* in his Relation touching the Isle of *St. Eriny's*, gives us this Account. Since, saies he, Princes have ceased to Succour this poor Eastern Church by Arms, our Kings continue to assist it by means, which altho not so Expensive and Famous, yet no less Effectual for the Salvation of Mens Souls, which ought to be the chief end of such like Undertakings. And in another place, Our Society being preserved in this Country by the Providence of God, and Charity of the Faithful, have not ceased to continue their Services to this desolate Church. And to the end the Fruit of our Labours may not be inclosed within the Walls of Constantinople, our Society has extended it self as far as Thessalonica, Patras, Athens, Naples de Romanis, Milos, Paros, where they have for some time Sojourned, and afterwards settled themselves at Smyrna, Scio, Naxie, Negrepont, *St. Eriny's*, not to mention Syria, where they have four other places of Residency, viz. Aleppo, Damascus, Seide, and Tripolys. And now they design for Mount Athos, and all other parts where Schisme and Heresy reign. And certainly they have undertaken no easy Task, having so many and distant Countries to Travel over, so many Errors to Oppose, and to Correct such a number of Abuses, which Ignorance and Heresy have Introduced amongst these People.

*Letter to the  
Clergy of  
France.*

*Mr. Thevenot* informs us, that there is a Convent of Capucin Fryars in the Isle of *St. Andra*, which do very much help the Bishop by their Preaching, and Discourfing of the Isle of *Chios*, he say's, that besides the Jesuits, who have a Church and Colledge, there are also Capucins, who teach humane Learning and Divinity, and also Jacobins, and Gray Fryars, who have all of 'em beautiful Churches. He tells us likewise, that in the Isle of *Nixia*, there are Jesuits, Recollets, and Capucins, who make great Progress in the propagating of the Catholick Faith. Besides the Jesuits and Capucins that are, according to *Thevenot's* Relation, in the Isle of *Chios*, the *Sieur Stochove* tels us of Carmelite Fryars who are there likewise.

*Thevenot's  
Voyages. Part  
1. C. 13. & C.  
61. & C. 66.*

*Stochove's  
Voyage.  
P. 225.*

*AT Smyrna* there are both Capucins and Jesuits, saies the *Sieur Boulaye Le Goux*, and *Villamont* observes that in the Isles of *Cephalonia*, and *Zant*, there are Religious of the Order of *St. Francis*.

*Boulaye Le  
Goux Part 1.  
C. 9. P. 20.*

WE know that the Jesuits have settled themselves since the Year 1609 at Constantinople. The Jesuits, saies the *Sieur Stochove*, have *St. Benner's* Church, where they are very well accommodated, having a fine Garden; The Church altho it be but small, yet is a very beautiful one, being covered with Mosaick Work. These Fathers, saies he, do make great Proficiency in the Conversion of the Hereticks and Schismaticks, Instructing them in the Catholick Apostolick Roman Faith. But besides the Jesuits, there are Jacobins, and Cordeliers. The Cordeliers, say's the *Sieur Du Loir*, are at *St. Marys*, the Jacobins at *St. Peters*, and the Jesuits at *St. Bennets*, which is a very fair Church and Painted also with Mosaick Work, very Rich, but not well Contrived. It is well known there are Emissaries likewise in *Hispaham* in *Persia*, who have spread themselves as far as the Borders of the Armenians. We have not seen any City in all our Travels, saies the *Sieur de Bourges*, which is better provided with Emissaries, the Reverend Fathers the Austin Portugais Monks, Carmelites, and Jesuits, have successively established themselves since some Tears: and by the Permission of the Prince, they exercise with a great deal of Liberty their Functions. The Reverend Fathers the Jesuits, having settled themselves at *Julfa*, which is a small City about a League distant from *Hispaham*, chiefly consisting of Armenians

*Villamont's  
Voyages.  
L. 2. C. 4.  
Stochove's  
Voyages.  
P. 93.*

*Loir's Voya-  
ges. P. 67.*

ans, have a particular Conveniency, for the Conversion of Schismatics. He tells us likewise, That there is at *Surat*, a Mission of French Capucins, and another at *Babylon*, and speaking of the former of these, These are, says he, the only Emissarys in this City. We have been Witnesses of the Respect shewed them, and of the Fruit of their Labours, to bring home to the Church the Armenians, Jacobites, and Nestorians.

I shall not trouble my self with mentioning the Missions of the *Indias*, nor them of *Ethiopia*, for the relations of these are publick, and known by all the World. We may read what *John Peter Maffée* and *du Faric*, both Jesuits have written in their Histories of the *Indias* touching this matter. And likewise the Relations of *Ethiopia* taken out of the Letters written to the General of the Jesuits *Viteleschy*, and another History of the *East Indias* Printed at *Atras* Anno 1628. but what I already mention'd is sufficient to discover the fallacy of Mr. Arnaud's Argument, who pretends to prove the Perpetuity of his Faith from the Testimony of the Schismatical Churches. For now after what I represented, all which has been faithfully transcribed out of Authors never suspected by the Church of *Rome*, what assurance can we have if the Doctrine of Transubstantiation, be found established amongst these people, that it has not been communicated to them by all these Emissaries, who have been sent for so many years, for no other purpose? It ought, methinks, to be shewed us (to colour over this proof) that the sources whence they drew their Christianity have not been adulterated, that these Springs have run clear, without being troubled to this day; or at least the time of these Missions must be laid aside, and Mr. Arnaud (if he intends to deal sincerely) must begin from the Ages which precede them; for if it does not appear these Schismatics believed the same as the Church of *Rome* concerning the Eucharist, before all this care for their instruction, what likelihood is there we shall suffer our selves to be surpriz'd by so frivolous an Argument. I will suppose for once that I was deceiv'd, when I maintain'd that any one of these Nations who profess the Christian Religion and submitted not to the Pope, did not reckon Transubstantiation amongst the Articles of their Creed, nor the Adoration of the Eucharist amongst their Rites and Ceremonies. Will Mr. Arnaud then imagine that my mistake has prejudiced my Cause, or justified the Consequence he pretends to draw from his Principle? This pretension of his in my mind, would be very unjust and unreasonable. For whether the Greeks and other Eastern Christians, do or do not believe Transubstantiation, this is only a question between him and me, to which the Subject I defend has no relation, and therefore he can expect no more at utmost than a Victory over me and not my Cause, seeing the Consequence he would draw hence will be continually disputed him, to wit, that Transubstantiation has been perpetually believed in these Churches. Whence it follows that he has been to blame in passing over so slightly as he has done, a point of this importance, on which depends the whole force of his Proofs, and he may justly be complain'd of in the Church of *Rome*, in that he hath in his whole proceeding betrayed a greater care for his own private Reputation, than that of the Church whose cause he takes upon him to defend. As to what concerns my self I hope I shall be able to give the World a good Account touching what I denied: and were I mistaken, I would not be ashamed to make an open Recantation without the least apprehension that this my Retraction would in any sort prejudice my Cause, seeing in effect, I do not believe it follows that a Doctrine has been perpetual  
in



in Religion, altho Schismatical Churches now profess it as well as the Latins. This Consequence must be proved, as well as its Principle, did Mr. Arnaud take a direct course and argue in a requisite manner to satisfy judicious Persons. And therefore he ought to have given a sincere account of this whole History of the *Missions*, which I come now from representing in this Chap. for I cannot imagine how Mr. Arnaud could pass over in silence as he has done, an History so important and necessary for the making of a right Judgment of this whole Controversie; seeing he could not be ignorant of it. If he believes he has done right, I must needs say, he has a kind of sincerity different from that of all other people; and if he believes he ought not to have taken this course, we must affirm, that his silence is so much the more criminal, in that he has acted against the light of his own Conscience.

## C H A P. V.

*That the means the Emissaries have used for the introducing of the Roman Religion amongst the Schismatics, The Seminaries which have been set up for the same design, and the particular Instructions given them touching the Doctrine of Transubstantiation, do sufficiently shew that there can no Advantage accrue to Mr. Arnaud by their belief. Mr. Arnaud's fifth Artifice discovered.*

WHOSOEVER considers the foregoing Chapters will not I suppose overmuch value Mr. Arnaud's Labours touching the Grecian and other Eastern Christians called *Schismatics*. For 'tis certain there was never a more vain and fruitless Amusement, than his whole Dispute on that Subject; at the end whereof I am much mistaken if he finds not he has ill bestowed his time, having given no light at all to the main Question, which is to know whether the Doctrine of the present Roman Church is the same with that of all Antiquity. But besides what I already offered, it remains, that I make some important Reflections on those things, the most part of which Mr. Arnaud has past over in silence, and which I shall recollect as briefly as I can in this Chapter, to the end I may not any longer detain the Reader on a point, which I believe I have sufficiently evidenced.

First, Then I find in the Relation of the Emissaries of St. Erins, that one of the reasons for which they were sent, was to endeavour the Advancement of the honour of the Holy Sacrament. The Author of these Relations desirous to give the World an account of the Honours they have endeavoured to procure from the Inhabitants of this Island, to the Sacrament, begins thus, *I believe, say's he, the Gentlemen of C. 20. P. 304. the Confraternity of the August Society of the Holy Sacrament, having testi-*  
O
fied

fied so great Zeal for the Advancement of this Devotion, especially in the Eastern Countries, will approve of these Discourses, seeing they will be inform'd by them that the Prayers and Vows they have made for the Conversion of these poor wretches, were not fruitless. These words sufficiently shew (if I be not mistaken,) that one of the chief ends which the Emissaries proposed to themselves in the Conversion of the Greeks, is to give them those Sentiments which they have not yet entertained concerning the Holy Sacrament, and 'tis unto this whereunto tends the Zeal and Prayers of the Confraternity.

WHENCE it follows, that 'tis no great wonder if they have accomplished their Design; and that if these people do at this day believe Transubstantiation and Adore the *Eucharist*, it cannot be hence concluded that this Doctrine has been amongst them ever since they first received the Christian Faith.

BUT the better to convince Mr. Arnaud of the vanity of his pretended Consequence, and how little I would esteem his victory if it were as real as it is false and imaginary; I need but set before him the means these Emissaries have used whereby to insinuate the Roman Religion, in these Countries, in all which I shall relate no more than what I learn from Authors no wise suspected by the Church of Rome.

THE first instrument they use is Money, *Francis Richard* the Jesuit, in the fore said Relation of the Isle of *St. Erins*, plainly tells us so. *Above an hundred poor Greeks, say's he, became our own, being drawn over to us by some small Charity we bestowed on them. Money can do all things in these parts, and we are certain that provided we had wherewithal to give the Greek Bishops, they would suffer us, to Confess, Preach and Instruct them who are under their Charge, in whatsoever we pleased.* So that are not these very fit people to determine the Antiquity of our Doctrines. *Anthony de Gouveau* one of the Emissaries of *Persia*, in his History of the Reduction of the *Armenians*, which were carried over into *Persia*, under the Conduct of the Patriarch *David*, expressly observes, that one of the first courses the Missionaries took to draw these people to them, was to distribute money amongst them, by which means they were easily wrought on to come to Catechisings.

C. 16. P. 247.

Anthony Gouveau's Relation lib. 3.

Relation of the Isle of St. Erins C. 15. P. 248.

BUT besides Money, they make the practice of Physick, to serve as a pretence, for the introducing of them into Houses, where they take their opportunity, to discourse of Religion. *By this means, say's the Jesuit Richard, we have free admittance into the Houses of the Greeks, and many times gain by Conversation what we could not effect by Preaching.*

Holy Syria part 1. 3 Treatise c. 5.

THE knowledge of the *Mathematicks* draws to 'em several persons and furnishes them with occasions of entertaining them. *Besson* the Jesuit, speaking of one of their Emissaries at *Damascus*; he drew, say's he, to our house several Greeks, by the fame of his Skill in the *Mathematicks*, which is a Science in great Esteem amongst the *Levantine* People, and especially *Astronomy*, upon which account our Emissaries have easie admittance into great Houses, whether of *Turks*, or *Christians*.

THEY endeavour more especially to gain the Bishops and Patriarchs, and that with success, as it will appear, by the Testimony I shall produce.

Father

CHAP. V. *pretends to draw from the Schismatical Churches.* 99

*Father Fohn Amien, say's Besson speaking of the Emissaries of Tripolys, gain'd* Ibid. Treatise the 4. c. 4.  
*the Greek Bishop of Tripolys to the Romish Religion.*

The same Besson, discoursing of the Mission in Aleppo, and of one of its Fathers, he hath intirely won, say's he, Philip the Patriarch, who is Patriarch of great Armenia whose Seat is in Persia, at Eschiniadzin. This venerable Prelate being come to Aleppo, to visit the holy Places, received the Father with great Expressions of good Will, and shewed him that he was a Catholick in his Heart, being of a very frank Nature, he farther declared this in the presence of another Patriarch. He say's moreover that this same Emissary converted an Armenian Bishop, who was afterwards forc'd by the Schismatics to leave his Country, and retire into a Monastery in Cappadocia, and would turn Jesuit, but, say's he, whatsoever great qualities he had, it was not judg'd meet to deprive the Armenians of this Pastour. Ibid. Treat. 1. c. 9.

Speaking in another place of an Emissary of Aleppo, he has brought over, say's he, to the Roman Church another Greek Bishop, and with this person endowed with such good Qualifications, he doubts not but he shall gain several others who will 'tis likely follow so great an Example. Certainly, adds he, in these Missions of the Levant there ought to be a particular regard had to the Bishops, whose Example the people will not fail to imitate. Ibid. chap. 10.

Discoursing elsewhere, of the Emissaries of Seyde. We are obliged, say's he, to the Bishop of the Greeks, who besides his being won to the Roman Church by one of our Fathers lays other Obligations on us. For he opens to us his Heart as well as his Church, and publicly declares to his hearers that the Frank's Church and that of the Maronites are, the true Churches. These Conquests cannot be lost, unless by the ill conduct of the Pastours, and the pernicious Maxims they may give out. Gain but one of them, and you gain them all, but if one of 'em holds out and will not yield, what you have done already signifies nothing. Treatise 6. c. 7.

Discoursing of the Mission of Aleppo, he say's that the Bishop of the Syrians at Aleppo, before his Ordination, conceived a great hatred against the Syrian Heresie, and turn'd Catholick, and within a while, went to Rome, from whence returning, he was Consecrated by the Patriarch of the Maronites, and settled in the Syrian Church at Aleppo. From whence being constrain'd to withdraw, he was brought there again at the request of the Curats and by the Assistance of Mr. Piquet. He generously serves, adds he, Almighty God amongst his own people, whom he exhorts to keep stedfast to the Church of Rome. And thus have the Endeavours of our Emissaries, been assisted by the Divine Grace, which we doubt not but will prove of great consequence to the Syrians, seeing that in gaining a person of his merit, they have done as much as if they had converted a whole Nation.

The Sieur Stochove, speaking of the Jesuits at Galata, These Fathers Endeavours, say's he, have not been ineffectual amongst the Hereticks and Schismatics, for they converted several Greek Bishops and disposed others, in case of any Revolution, to adhere to the Roman Church. Stochovius's Voyages p. 98.

I acquainted my self, say's Busbequius, the Emperour's Embassadour, with Metrophanus the Metropolitan and Superiour of the Monastery of Chalcy, he is an honest and learned Man, and one that passionately desires the re-union of Busbeq. Voyages lib 4. p. 26.



*the two Churches, contrary to the custom of his Nation, who detests them of our Communion, as prophane and impure Persons.*

Gouveau's relation lib 5. 3.

**GOUVEAU** the Monk relating how he and other *Augustin Portugais* proceeded in order to the Re-union of the *Armenians* in *Persia* to the Roman Church, tells us, that they particularly applyed themselves to the winning *David* their *Patriarch*, making use of him afterwards as an instrument to prevail on the Bishops and all the rest of the People.

NOW tell me, I pray after this, with what sincerity the *Greeks* and other *Eastern Christians* can be alledged in this matter? they are won by Money, several pretences are made use of by the Emissaries to introduce themselves into their houses, they prevail on their Bishops, not making them publicly change their Religion, but leaving them in the same Communion wherein they find them, to the end that they may likewise endeavour the Establishment of the *Roman Faith*. Now what can be said of these people, but that if they believe Transubstantiation (it not appearing they believed it before all these Intrigues) they have received this Doctrine from the Emissaries, by these indirect ways which they practise.

BUT this is not all, for one of the most usual and effectual Courses they take to establish insensibly, and without any noise, the Roman Religion in *Greece*, and amongst all other Nations, is the instruction of their Youth, which employment they commonly take upon them wheresoever they come; for under pretence of instructing them in Human Learning, they instil into their minds the Principles of the *Romish Faith*, so that a great part of the *Greek Prelates* are of this number, that is to say their Schollars, having received from them in their tender Age a favourable Opinion of the Roman Church.

Voyages of M. de la Haye c. 5. pag. 125.

WE are inform'd by the Author of *M. de la Haye's Voyages* who was Ambassador to the late King of *France*, that the *Jesuits* at *Galata*, are very successful in their undertakings in this kind; for besides their Preaching and Confessions, they instruct all the Youth, as also the Schismatics, whom they have convinced (for the most part of them) of their Errors, so that several Principal *Greek Bishops* and *Archbishops*, (who have been their Schollars) do favour the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, and are capable of doing it great Service.

Stochov. Voyages pag. 98.

THE *Sieur Stochovius*, speaks to the same effect, the *Greeks*, say's he, do not at all scruple the sending their Children to School (he means to that of the *Jesuits*) wherein they are instructed as well in the *Catholick Religion*, as in *Human Learning*. And discoursing of the *Isle of Chios*, he tells us, that the *Jesuits* have a strong-built Convent there, besides a fair Church, that they are twenty in number who are all of them naturaliz'd, and take upon them according to their custom the instruction of Youth, and bring divers over to the true Religion. The *Carmelites*, adds he, have a Church and Convent there, who likewise apply themselves to the instructing of Youth, and convert divers from the common Heresie of the *Greeks*.

Loir's Voyages pag. 67. Thevenor, part. I c. 61.

THE *Sieur du Loir* tells us likewise, that the *Jesuits* of *Galatia*, keep School for the Children of the *Greeks* and *Armenians*. And the *Sieur Thevenor*, not informs us, that in the *Isle of Chios*, there is a Convent of *Capucins* who teach human Learning and the *Christian Doctrine*, to several Children, who repair

pair thither. He tells us in another place, that in the Isle of *Andria* the *Capucins* do greatly ease the Bishop, by their *Preachings* and *Confessions*, and by *Chap. 13.*  
*their School, to which go all the Greek Children, and that some are sent from Athens*  
*for that purpose.*

*L A Boulaye le Goux* tells us, that the *Jesuits* have a convenient House at *Smyrna* wherein they instruct the *Greek Children*. And the same do they at *St. Erinys*, as appears by the relation of *Richard* the Jesuit, who introduces another Jesuit speaking as follows, *I set open my School every day to all that will come and learn any thing, being ever ready and most willing to instruct Youth, as well out of Obedience to my Superiour, who earnestly recommended to me this course, as for that likewise it has been revealed to me from Heaven, that this is the surest way to reform by degrees the Greek Church, and perhaps one of the most likeliest means to maintain us in these forraign Countries.* Boulay's V. 34  
ages part. 1.  
c. 9.  
Relat. of St.  
Erinys c. 5.

IT already appears, by these Testimonies, that one of the principal things recommended to the *Emissaries*, when they are to be sent abroad, is the Education of Children, as an infallible means to set up the *Romish Religion* in the midst of these people, and that the *Emissaries* on their side do well acquit themselves in this particular. But the Author of the Book called *A Description of the Holy Land*, delivers himself more plainly. For discoursing how the *Jesuits* employ themselves in the City of *Aleppo*, he tells us, that their chief business is to instruct Youth, which has always been esteemed a matter of great importance and highly conducing to the reformation of these Nations. Observe, I beseech you, what he says, that the *Emissaries* do not only carefully apply themselves to this, and that by order from their Superiors, but that this is an especial means to make all these people in a short time to become insensibly *Roman Catholics*.

BUT we must likewise take notice that these Gentlemen who leave no means untried, do wholly betake themselves to these two last ways, namely, that of gaining the Prelates and that of instructing Youth. For when they have won any Bishop to their Party, they oblige him to set them upon the educating of their Children, making use of his Authority that they may manage their business with greater success and security. Which the same Author of the *Holy Land* shews us, *Father Queriot*, say's he, was a fit person to offer his service to the *Greek Metropolitan*, who was a good Catholic, and a man of a strict Life (he means the Metropolitan of *Aleppo*) he has oblig'd him to trust us with the Education of the *Grecian Children* of that Country, and to slight the discourses of the Enemies of the *Roman Religion*. And a little farther, it is to be moreover observed, say's he, that the Patriarch of Constantinople reprehending him for employing a Religious Frank in the teaching of the Greeks, even in his Episcopal House, this great man who is ever like himself, does notwithstanding permit the Father to proceed on still in his undertaking. Holy Syria  
part. 1. Treat  
1. c. 4.

SPEAKING of the Mission of *Damascus*, this Mission, say's he, is the work of *Father Jerom Queriot* who was sent from *Aleppo* to *Damascus*, in the beginning of the year 1643, by the *Greek Patriarch Euthymius*, who was of the Isle of *Chios*, and of the *Romish Religion*, for the instruction of Youth, and especially of his Nephew, and for the composition of his circular Letters and *Greek and Arabian Patents*. Yet he tells us, this Father was forc'd to leave

the

the place, the Greeks growing jealous of him, in as much as that he being a Religious Frank was employed in the chief affairs of the Patriarchate.

I cannot forbear mentioning what the said Author relates on the same Subject, namely, the instruction of the Greek Youth. *We must betake our selves to this Course, say's he, for the converting the Greek Schismatics. We are too old, said Jerasimus an Archbishop and Vicar of the Patriarchate, to receive new Impressions : but instruct our Youth, who by your care will be capable of trying good things and prove a Seminary of perfect Christians ; words, say's he, which he uttered in the hearing of the Youth on purpose to encourage them to make use of the advantage offered them. It is certainly a great satisfaction to us when we see young Greeks who are naturally eloquent, to instruct so handsomely their Servants ; and I had almost said, even their very Parents, who become as it were their Disciples in Religion. Is there any thing more great and glorious than the building of new Churches with the Apostles, and converting the World? For new Churches are planted by the settlement of these Missions, and the old ones repaired at the same time, by means of the Instruction of Children who teach their Parents. This Jesuit lays open the matter plainly and sincerely, whereas Mr. Arnaud does not so, for he would have these new Churches pass for old ones.*

THE same Author relates that having observ'd *John Damascen* was esteem'd in this Country as an infallible Doctor, and that his Testimony against Heresies was of great weight with them ; *One of our Fathers, say's he, undertook to teach this Saints Logick and Divinity touching the controverted Points. He say's, this invention took, and inspired the Schollars with great Zeal. But say's he, this their forwardness was taken notice of by some envious Persons, who informed the Vicar of the Patriarchate of the matter, and so far incensed him that he caus'd the young Students to be brought before him, and having reprehended their Boldness, condemned their Opinions and charged them to desist from such Discourses, adding therewithal, that if they obeyed not his Commands, he would ruine them and their Families. These Arguments, say's he, could not prevail with the Schollars to change their Opinions, or break off their Assemblies, and forsake their Masters, but they were more cautious afterwards, and did forbear publishing any thing in the Circles as they had heretofore done.*

IT is is an easie matter to comprehend the Advantage the Church of Rome makes of the labours of these Emissaries ; and to be more particularly informed thereof, we need but read what the *Sieur Poulet* has written concerning the Jesuits, and their manner of proceedings in the East. *They rightly understood, say's he, how difficult it is to work on the mind of a Person grown old in his Errors, and that the first impressions being strengthened by a long custom, become a new Nature in us, wherefore our instructions must be bestowed on them whose minds are not yet corrupted by Maxims of Schism and Heresie. They have therefore very advisedly, set up Schools, whereunto the Children of Schismatics and sometimes of Turks too do resort. The desire of having some Images, or Agnusses draws them to our Congregations, where hearing our Doctrine, they become effectually Catholics without perceiving themselves to be so : as for the other Schismatics, they hear our Sermons, and pretend to be Catholics only in hope of some Advantage they expect by this their Dissimulation.*

Poulet's Voy-  
ages 2. part.  
C. 20.



WE need likewise but read what *Besson* the Jesuit has written, touching the proceedings of the Society at *Aleppo*. *The Religious Orders*, say's he, even the most regular amongst them, have received from the Society at *Aleppo* not a few Advantages, and the Eastern Church has had such Prelates from them as are at this day the greatest lights of the Syrian Clergy. Whereupon he tells us in another place, that the Greeks and Syrians admit Apostolical Men into their Houses. They likewise permit them the use of their Churches, and the Curats accept of our help, the Bishops entreat us to prune their Vines, and this Church in the East being now weary of its miseries, and blinded with its tears, expects from the West the most pure lights of the Gospel.

Part. 1. Tr.  
1. C. 11.

Part. 1. Tr.  
1. C. 2.

I confess these Gentlemen have been very dext'rous and fortunate in performing what has been given them in charge, and that the Church of *Rome* in general is very much obliged to them, but I find Mr. *Arnaud* to be more fortunate than they: for it seems as if these persons had foreseen long before, by a Prophetical Spirit, the book Mr. *Arnaud* was to make, and therefore would prepare him Materials, and furnish him with this fine Collection of Attestations and Testimonies. Who would ever have thought that these Gentlemen the Jesuits should pass over the Seas and run to the farthest parts of the World to do Mr. *Arnaud* honour? Yet is it true, that they have been his Messengers, and a man would be apt to think, they went only into these Countrys upon his account.

NEITHER must we pass over in silence the Seminaries, establish'd in *Rome*, and other places, for the bringing up of Greek Children, wherein they are taught on one hand the Rites and Ceremonies of the Greek Church, and on the other, the Doctrines and Opinions of the Church of *Rome*: for leaving these Schools, they betake themselves to the East, where it frequently happens they are called to the Exercise of Ecclesiastical Functions, and these are as so many of the Court of *Romes* Creatures, who endeavour to the utmost of their power to establish the Doctrines and Maxims of the *Latins*. It is well known that during the Popedom of *Gregory* the XIII, there was a Colledge founded at *Rome*; to what end, we may be informed by *Leo Allatius*. The Colledge of the Greeks, say's he, was built in *Gregory* the thirteenth's time, to the end the Grecian Children might learn the Arts and Sciences, which are not now to be found in Greece, and also be instructed in the Catholick Religion, that they may afterwards communicate it to others, and especially to them of their own Nation. And in the following Chapter, relating what means has been used to propagate the Roman Religion in Greece, since those Countrys have been possessed by the Turks, he adds, Thus thro a long series of time has Religion made its progress in Greece. But at length *Gregory* the XIII, desirous to quench the fire which wasted all Greece, and remedy its miseries, has therefore caused to be built at *Rome* the Greek Church, which he Dedicated to St. *Athenasius*. He bought likewise at the same time, the neighbouring Houses, for Dwellings to entertain the Greek Schollars which should be brought over from Greece, being all the Children of Greeks. He gave likewise a considerable yearly Revenue for their Maintenance; to the end that they being instructed in the Greek and Latin Tongues might serve as an Ornament and help to their distressed Country. Now this is not a matter needs proving, seeing this Church continues even to this day at *Rome*, in the same use for which 'twas intended.

De Perp Consi  
lib. 3. cap. 6.  
pag 970.

THE Fruits gathered hence are not inconsiderable, for there has been and is now every day sent, I know not how many persons, full of Zeal for the Roman Church its Rites and Ceremonies, into the East, who spreading themselves over all parts of it, and professing the Religion of the Schismatical *Greeks*, and living in the same Communion with them, do not fail to insinuate the Doctrines of the Church of *Rome* into their minds. *Leo Allatius* has made a Catalogue of these Persons, which the curious may see, if they please, he has observ'd that several of them have been made Archbishops, and a great number of others promoted to Episcopal Charges: some of them having been too zealous, occasion'd the *Greeks* to rise up against them; and others have been so succesful in their Endeavours, that they gained the very Patriarchs of *Constantinople* themselves. He mentions amongst others one *Josaphat Azales*, who having finish'd his Studies in the Seminary, was sent to *Messene*, a City of *Peloponessus*, to instruct the Monks of *St. Basil* who live there, and having been some time after made *Papas*, that is to say, a Greek Priest, he went to Mount *Athos*, and there say's *Allatius*, he taught the true Faith. Now it is to be observed, that this Mount *Athos* is the general Seminary of the whole *East*, as *Mr. Arnaud* tells us, it being from thence the *Religious* do disperse themselves over all *Greece*; from this place they have their Patriarchs, Archbishops and Bishops, so that to carry the Roman Religion to Mount *Athos*, it is to go to the source, which is a means to gain in a short time all the *Greeks*. He mentions another, whom he calls *Ignatius Mindon*, who leaving the Seminary, returned into *Greece*, where he taught several years; and from thence went to *Trebizonde* which is a City on *Pont Euxin*, where as before he set himself to the instructing of people, and that with such success, that he was taken by them for a Prophet; And in fine, being sent for by *Raphael* the Patriarch of *Constantinople*, to be Rector of the Patriarchal Church at *Pera*, he endeavoured, say's he, with all his power to advance the Interest of the Church of *Rome*.

Arcudius Ep.  
pitt. ad Sigism.  
Regem Polo-  
niae de reb.  
Mosc. pag. 10.

IT is in this Seminary wherein were brought up two Persons who made a great noise in the World, to wit, *John Mathew Caryophilus* Archbishop of *Iconia*, and *Peter Arcudius*; the first of these was sent into *Greece*, but having not discreetly carried himself, was forc'd for his preservation, to return to *Rome*, where he set himself to writing against the *Greeks*: and the other was sent into *Poland*, *Lituania*, *Russia* and *Muscovia*, where he employed himself, according to his own relation for the space of twenty years in the propagating of the Roman Faith.

Bibl. Select.  
lib. 6. cap. 1.

*POSSEVIN* the Jesuit writing to Pope *Gregory* the 13th, touching the means to be used for the introducing of the Doctrines of the Roman Church amongst the *Moscovits*; he so highly esteems Seminaries, that he advises him to settle one at *Rome*, for the *Russians*, and another at *Vilna* in *Lituania*, where he say's, that the Jesuits have likewise their Colledge in which there are many Schollars. He tells us in another place, that this Pope in effect founded several Seminaries for the *Russians* in *Lituania* and other places.

Spondanus.  
Annal. rom. 3.  
7d ann. 1584

M. the Bishop of *Pamiez* having told us in his Annals that *Gregory* founded a Seminary at *Rome* for the *Maronites*, says farther, that the same Pope founded

founded others for the Eastern and Northern Countries as well at *Rome* as in the Provinces.

AS to what remains we must not imagine the *Turks*, under whose Government the *Greeks* live, do hinder the Endeavours of the *Latins*; it was never heard of, say's *John Cottovicius*, that the *Turks* have been in any sort severe against the Religious, who having finished their Studies at *Rome*, and taken Orders, returned into their own Countrys and were raised to Dignities, nor that the *Turkish* Magistrate hath upon this account made them suffer the least Damage. In effect provided they oppose not their Religion, they are ready enough to connive at all other matters. They favour them that give 'em most Money, and from thence 'tis we see on the Patriarchal See of *Constantinople*, Persons who keep a good Correspondency with the Court of *Rome*, or else such who have been the *Jesuits* Schollars, who seeing themselves rais'd to this Dignity, do not fail to favour, as much as in them lies, this change so long prosecuted: and 'tis in this rank we must place *Raphael*, *Neophytus*, *Timotheus*, *Cyrellus* of *Berrhaa*, and I know not how many others whom the *Roman* Party has at divers times helped to the Patriarchate, and who in requital did them afterwards great Service.

ALL this, me thinks, shews evidently that Mr. *Arnaud* has been very disingenuous in his whole proceeding, who concealing these *Intrigues*, confidently undertakes to convince us, of the Antiquity of the *Roman* Creed touching the Eucharist, upon this Principle, that this same Doctrine is held by other Christian Churches, as if all the passages from *Rome* to *Greece* were so blocked up that these Doctrines could never be transported thither, or as if the *Latins* had never attempted this. Had these People received these Doctrines elsewhere, or invented them themselves; Mr. *Arnaud* would have some pretence for his Argument; neither could we then charge him with asserting things as we do now against the light of his own Conscience: But seeing he knew well enough, the *Latins* have been perpetually endeavouring to introduce their Doctrines in these Countrys, and constantly laboured at this, since I know not how many Ages; he therefore upon supposal they have effected this, comes and offers us the belief of these People as an undoubted Proof of the *Perpetuity* of this Doctrine, this is, to speak modestly, such a way of proceeding as will never be approved by just and reasonable men.

IT will perhaps be objected, that I do indeed here shew, That the *Latins* endeavour'd to insinuate their Religion in the *East*; but that I do not make it particularly appear, they at any time endeavour'd to introduce their Doctrine of Transubstantiation. To which I answer first, this is not necessary; for proposing only to my self at present, to shew the Nullity of the Consequence Mr. *Arnaud* pretends to draw in order to the proving of the *Perpetuity* of the *Roman* Creed, touching Transubstantiation, in that he imagines the Eastern Churches hold the same, it suffices me to shew thereupon, That this Opinion might be communicated to them by the *Latins* themselves, in their several attempts to introduce their Religion into the *East*, especially considering that Transubstantiation is one of the most important Doctrines of it. And if Mr. *Arnaud* would have his Proof subside, he must set aside all the time of these efforts we now mentioned, and betake himself only to those Ages which preceded them. For unless he proves, that Transubstantiation has been believed in these Churches, before all these endea-



vours to bring them over to the Roman Faith, there is no Person endued with sense, but will perceive how little strength his Argument carries along with it, seeing he is ever lyable to be told, they have received it from the *Latins*, it not appearing amongst them before.

Raynald. ad  
ann. 1267.  
num. 75.

BUT in the second place, I will not have it stick here, to the end Mr. Arnaud may receive full satisfaction touching this point. I say then, that in the Year 1267. Clement the Fourth intending to make his Advantage of that great Earnestness Michael Paleologus shewed for the Reunion of his Church with the Roman (as it has been observed in the third Chap. of this Book) he thereupon sent him a Confession of Faith, which he would have received by the *Greeks*, because he found that which the *Greeks* sent him, not only deficient in several things, but full of Errors, altho the Fryar *Minorites* then at *Constantinople* had accepted it. Now Amongst other Articles in this Confession there is one, which relates to the Eucharist, and which runs thus in Latin. *Sacramentum Eucharistiae ex azymo conficit eadem Romana Ecclesia, tenens & docens quod in ipso Sacramento panis verè transubstantiatur in Corpus, & Vinum in Sanguinem Domini nostri Jesu Christi*, which is to say, the Church of Rome Celebrates the Sacrament of the Eucharist with unleavened Bread, Believing and Teaching that in this Sacrament the Bread is really transubstantiated into the Body, and the Wine into the Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ. He sent afterwards Dominicans to Confirm this Confession and procure its acceptance with the *Greeks*.

Raynald. ad  
ann. 1272.  
num. 27.

IN the Year 1272, Gregory the Tenth sent Fryar *Minorites* into Greece, to endeavour afresh the Reduction of the *Greeks*, under the Authority of the same Michael Paleologus, who resolved to finish this Affair at any rate, and to whom he likewise recommended the same Confession of Faith.

Idem ad ann.  
1288. num. 30.

IN the Year 1288. Pope Nicholas the Fourth sent Fryar *Minorites* into *Esclavonia*, to bring off these People from the Greek Religion to that of the Church of Rome, he gave them Letters to King *Uroslus*, and *Helena* the Queen Mother; and recommended to 'em the same Form of Doctrine, containing the Article of Transubstantiation, to the end this might be the Rule of their instructions to the People.

Ibid. num. 33.

THE same Pope sent it likewise to three Bishops in the East, who embraced his Communion, exhorting them to instruct the People according to the Doctrine contained therein, and at the same time he recommended to them the Emissaries sent into those Countries, for the Conversion of the *Greeks*, *Bulgarians*, *Valaquians*, *Syrians*, *Iberians*, *Alains*, *Russians*, *Jacobites*, *Nestorians*, *Georgians*, *Armenians*, *Indians*; whence it is easie to conjecture, that the Emissaries were likewise enjoined to use this Formulary.

Raynald. ad  
ann. 1318.  
num. 13.

IN the Year 1318. Pope Innocent the twenty Second sent this Confession to the King of *Armenia*; And not only, say's Rynaldus, The *Armenians* which inhabited *Cilicia*, and *Armenia* embraced the Doctrine of the Roman Church: but others also who being driven out of their Country by the *Sarracens*, had retired into *Chersonesus Taurique*. They submitted themselves to the Roman Church, in the presence of the Bishop of *Capha*, who was a *Latin*. The Pope, adds he, congratulated them, and shewed 'em, that in the Divine Mysteries, the Substance of Bread is changed into the Body and Blood of Christ, the Species remaining entire.

IN

IN the Year 1338. *Bennet* the Twelfth received Letters from the *Alains*, Idem ad ann. 1338. num. 77. who were a sort of Christians, that professed the Greek Religion, and lived under the Government of the *Tartars*. He return'd them an answer, and sent the Confession of Faith I already mention'd for their Instruction. *Raynaldus* refers this Letter to the Year 1338. But there is an old Book lately cited intitled *The marvelous History of the great Cham of Tartaria*, which refers this to the Year 1328. The Article of Transubstantiation is expressly mentioned in it.

IN the Year 1366. *Fohn Paleologus* the *Grecian* Emperor designing to reunite himself to the Church of *Rome*, that he might be assisted against the *Turks*, Pope *Urbain* the Fifth sent him, as his Predecessors had done to *Michael* this same Confession of Faith. Idem ad ann. 1366. num. 6.

SO that here then the *Latins* are not only enjoined to propagate their Religion in general amongst the *Eastern* Christians, but particularly the Doctrine of Transubstantiation, and to the end it may not be said this Confession contains the other Points of the Christian Faith, as well as that of the *Substantial Conversion*, it is to be observed, that it has two distinct parts: in the first of which the Articles of the Apostles Creed are explained, and in the other there are several particular points expressly determined by the Church of *Rome*, *propter diversas Hæreses a quibusdam ex ignorantia & ab aliis ex malitia introductas*, by reason of certain *Heresies* introduc'd by the ignorance of some, and Malice of others. Now 'tis under these last points that the Doctrine of Transubstantiation is contained; which plainly shews, that this Doctrine was propos'd to them as lately defined by the Church of *Rome*, and of which those People had at that time no certain Knowledge.

*MR. Arnaud* then must seek elsewhere for Proofs whereon to ground his pretension touching the Antiquity of the Opinion in question, and I will not stick to affirm, he must be an extraordinary Person if he can solidly acquit himself of what I have lay'd before him, and in all which I desire him to produce a false Quotation. He has been shewed five remarkable deceits whereby he has imposed on the World, in concealing whatsoever was necessary to be known in order to a right understanding of this Controversie, and in turning to a vain and unprofitable use whatsoever concludes directly against him. He has been shewed the profound Ignorance wherein these People have lay'n from the eleventh Century to this present, and the fond Superstitions reigning amongst them, which makes them very unfit Judges of our Controversie. He has been shewed the miserable condition of these Churches in respect of Temporals, and the Violences offered them by the *Latins* to make them change their Religion. We have represented him with the Persecutions they suffered from their own Princes upon this account; We have observed all these Countries ore-spread with Monks and Emissaries, time out of mind, and that without interruption to this day; We have represented him with a particular account of what the Emissaries do, and what the Seminaries contribute towards the making them receive the Roman Faith. And in fine, we have shewed him, that one of their chiefest cares for these People was to make them learn the Mystery of the *Substantial Conversion*. Now after this, whether they do believe it, or not, it is an indifferent matter in respect of the main

of our Controverſie. So that it only now lies upon me to vindicate my own particular Reputation; that is to ſay, whether I have rightly or no affirmed that they do not believe it, and which I ſhall demonſtrate by God's Aſſiſtance in the following parts of this Work, and that in ſuch a manner as I doubt not but will ſatiſfie all reaſonable Perſons.

# BOOK



## BOOK III.

Wherein is shewn that the Greek Schismatical Church  
so called holds not Transubstantiation.

## CHAP. I.

*The Question stated, and M. Arnaud's sixth Deceit manifested.*

**I**T may be remembred, that at the beginning of this Dispute touching the Schismatical Churches, I undertook to prove the truth of of these three Propositions. First, that when Mr. *Arnaud* shall prove what he pretends concerning these Churches, since the eleventh Century to this present, yet will it not thence follow that the Doctrine of the *Roman* Church, touching the Eucharist has been perpetual in the Christian Religion, or the change in question impossible, or that it hath not actually hapned. Secondly, That the true Greek Church and others which the *Latins* call Schismaticks, never reckoned Transubstantiation amongst the Articles of their Belief, nor the Adoration of the Eucharist amongst their Rites and Ceremonies. Thirdly, That whatsoever Mr. *Arnaud* has offered to prove the Affirmative, is void and ineffectual, and that even the greatest part of his Proofs conclude the contrary of that which he pretends. I have already made good the first of these Propositions in the preceding Book, and shall in this inquire into the belief of the Greeks, from the eleventh Century to this present; that I may thereby accommodate my self to Mr. *Arnaud's* Method. And as to the other Greek Churches, I shall treat of them in my fifth Book. But it is first necessary to lay down the true State of the Question, to the end, that what we undertake may be the better understood, and Mr. *Arnaud's* Deceit more plainly detected. Who continually wanders from the point in dispute, supposing impossibilities, proving impertinencies and confounding what ought to be distinguished.

WE must know then there are two sorts of Greeks, the one reunited to the Church of *Rome*, who acknowledge the Popes Jurisdiction, and receive the Decrees of the *Florentine* Council, living in Peace with the *Latins*; The other acknowledge only their own Patriarchs, having their Communion apart, and separate from the *Latins*. And this I suppose Mr. *Arnaud* or his Friends will not deny, seeing that in their Observations on the Request of M. the Archbishop of *Ambrun* they have themselves made this distinction of the *Greek Catholick Church*, and the *Greek Schismatical one*. It is needless to alledge other Proofs touching a matter of Fact so well known. In effect the Endeavours of the *Latins* to subject the *Greeks* to themselves have not been wholly fruitless, for besides that in *Greece* it self and other *Patriarchates*, they have acquired

acquired a great number of Persons and intire Families, besides this I say, there are whole Nations which observe the Decrees of the Council of *Florence*, and live under the Jurisdiction of the See of *Rome*, who yet still observe the Rites and Customs of the *Greeks*. We may place in this rank all the *Greeks* in *Italy*, *Rome*, *Venice*, *Tuscany*, the Kingdoms of *Sicily* and *Naples*, which are called *Italian Greeks*, we may also bring under this Rank a great part of them who live under the Government of the *Venetians*. For *Allatius* testifies, that not only all these do observe the same Ceremonies as them of the *East*, but that the Pope likewise obliges them to an Observance of them, and therefore maintains a *Greek Bishop* to confer Orders according to the *Greek Mode*, to hinder 'em from receiving them in the *East*, from the hands of Schismatics. We must likewise comprehend the *Russians* which inhabit black *Russia*, and *Podolia*, under the Government of the King of *Poland*; who submitted themselves to the Church of *Rome* towards the end of the last Century. *Arcudius* commends *Sigismund* the Third, for that he did not only sollicite but in a manner constrain them to make this Union, *ut ad Romanam*, says he, *hoc est veram Dei Ecclesiam se adjungerent excitasti ac pene dixerim impulisti*. Our Question does not concern them, their Submission to the *Roman* See evidently excludes them from this Dispute, I expressly excepted them, when I denied that the *Greeks* and other Christians held Transubstantiation, and Adored the Sacrament, having said in plain terms, *except those that submit themselves to the Pope*.

*Arcud. Epist. ad Sigismund.*

Answer to the first Treatise towards the end.

SECONDLY, We must remember that one of the chief Advantages the Church of *Rome* makes of these forementioned Seminaries, and Emissaries in *Greece*, is the gaining of Profelytes and instructing young People in its Doctrines, to use them afterwards for the Conversion of others, as I shewed in the preceding Book. Now *Mr. Arnaud* cannot in reason bring these sort of People into the reckoning, and I think it will not be taken ill, if I separate them from the rest, for in effect the Abuse would be too gross to pretend to determine this Question touching the *Greek Church*, by the Testimony of Converts, or Persons brought up from their Infancy amongst the *Jesuits* and other Religious Orders and Latin Doctors, who instructed them in their Doctrines; and I have already shewn, that the number of these is not small, and *Allatius* himself assures us of it. *The Greeks*, says he, *that reverence the Pope and receive his Decrees as Oracles are more in number than we imagine, and were they not withheld by the fear of a most cruel Tyrant, and that of the Calumnies and Accusations of some wicked People, we should see every day, them who possess the greatest Dignities amongst the Greeks, come and prostrate themselves at the Popes Foot-stool*. This is the Fruit of the *Missions* and *Seminaries*.

*Allat. de perp. conf. lib. 3. cap. 11.*

*Lib. 2. C. 11.*

*Lib. 2. C. 13.*

*Lib. 2. C. 15.*

IN the third place, the Question is not here, whether the *Greeks* have the same Opinion with us concerning the Sacrament? This is *Mr. Arnauds* continual device to dispute on this Principle, to wit, that I affirm the *Greeks* to be of the same Opinion with us. As for example, he takes a great deal of pains to shew that 'tis not likely we would make use of *Euthymius* his words to instruct a man in our Doctrine, and that *Euthymius* has not taken the term *Eft*, in our Saviour's words, *This is my Body*, in the sense of *Significat*. He likewise takes a great deal of pains to prove that *Nicholas Methoniensis* was not a *Berengarian* and one that believed the Bread was the Figure of our Saviour's Body, that the Profession of Faith which the *Saracens* were caused to make when they embraced the Christian Religion, was not in such terms as to make

make them understand that the Bread and Wine were not really our Saviour's Body, but only the Figure or Representation thereof indued with its Virtue, and that Pope *Innocent* the Third did not reproach the *Greeks* with their believing that they eat only the Figure of Christ's Body. All this is but a mere Artifice to impose on the World, and blind those that have not continually the point in question in their minds; and suffer themselves to be easily carried off from one Subject to another. I say then it concerns us not to know, whether the belief of the *Greeks* touching the Eucharist, is the same in every particular with that of ours, and whether they explain themselves on that Subject in the same manner as we do. This we never yet affirmed to Mr. *Arnaud*, but the contrary, viz, *That several* Answer to the first Treatise. *of the Greeks have since the seventh Century rejected the terms of Figure, Image, and Type, which the Ancients made use of and we use after their example.* The present Question is, whether the *Greeks* do believe concerning the Sacrament what the Church of *Rome* doth, this is the only point of the Dispute, to which Mr. *Arnaud* ought to have stuck, and not to wander into wide Discourses and fruitless Consequences. In effect the design of the Treatise of the *Perpetuity* being to make us confess, *that the belief of the Church of Rome touching the Eucharist, has been perpetual in all Ages,* and that Author of the *Perpetuity* First Treatise of the Perpetuity. having for this purpose made use of the Conformity of the *Greeks* with her in this Point, and this Conformity having been denied, it is clear, that the Question does not concern our Sentiment, but that of the *Roman Church*, to know whether the *Greeks* hold and teach the same thing.

IN the fourth place, our Dispute hitherto has not been concerning the *real Presence*, as Mr. *Arnaud* supposes, but only on the Subject of Transubstantiation, and the Adoration thereon appendant; so that he has dealt very disingeniously, in making the World believe that our debate reached to the *Real Presence*: Our Question, say's he, is concerning the belief of all these *Lib. 2. C. 3. P. 128.* *Seets and People touching Transubstantiation and the Real Presence.* 'Tis yet more absurdly he complains that contrary to the intention of the Author of the *Perpetuity*, I have turned the Question upon Transubstantiation. *Notwithstanding,* say's he, *that the Author of the Perpetuity has only in his first* Ibid. *Treatise discoursed of the Real presence, and contented himself with maintaining that this Doctrine was received by all these Schismatical Churches; yet Mr. Claude has continually turn'd the Question upon Transubstantiation, which was not the point precisely in question.* But in fine, 'tis the effect of a most unwarrantable Liberty to write, *that he knows not whether the boldness of a man can proceed* Lib. 2. C. 10. P. 191. *to that point where mine must needs be, in maintaining to the end that the Real Presence and Transubstantiation are Doctrines unknown to the Greek Church.* And I dare to affirm that his cannot be greater than it is, for 'tis certain, that here the Question only concerns Transubstantiation and the Adoration, and not the *Real Presence*, concerning which I have not yet said any thing. 1. Let Mr. *Arnaud* read the last Section of my first Answer, and he will find precisely these words; *I affirm that Transubstantiation and the Adoration of the Sacrament, are two things unknown to all the World, the Roman Church excepted; for neither the Greeks, nor the Armenians, Russians, Jacobites, Ethiopians, nor in general any Christians but them who have submitted themselves to the Pope, do believe anything touching these two Articles.* 2. Let the passages of my second Answer be perused where I handle again the same Question, and it will be found that they only concern Transubstantiation, there being no mention therein of the *Real Presence*. 3. I desire the Reader to peruse the last Chapter of the second Treatise of the *Perpetuity*, and he will find it contains these words  
for



for its Title. *That all the Sects separate from the Church of Rome are at accord with her, in the point of Transubstantiation, and especially the Greeks.* He will find likewise that in the body of the Chapter there is not a word of the Real Presence.

THERE is nobody then but Mr. *Arnaud*, who has thought of bringing it into our debate, and this without any other reason but that he will have it so, maugre us, imagining he shall be able to save himself by the Ambiguity of the term of Real Presence. For as to what he tells us, that the Author of the *Perpetuity* speaks only in his first Treatise of the Real Presence, and contents himself with asserting That this Doctrine was received by all the Schismatical Churches, I am sorry I must tell him that I know not any man that writes things on such slight grounds as he does; nor so easily exposes his Reputation in asserting matters of Fact, of whose untruth he is lyable to be convinced by every one that can read. For not to go farther we need but read, to find in the fourteenth Page of the first Treatise, that the Author proposes to himself, *to make any man confess who is not extremely obstinate by the evidence of truth it self, that the belief of the Church of Rome touching this Mystery is the same with that of all Antiquity.* Now every body knows that the belief of the Church of Rome reaches as far as Transubstantiation. We need but read moreover for this purpose the eighteenth and nineteenth Pages of the first Treatise, wherein the Author of the *Perpetuity* being desirous to shew us the universality of the Doctrine of the Church of Rome, tells us, *that Lanfranc having explained the Catholick Doctrine in these terms; We believe the Terrestrial Substances of Bread and Wine being divinely Sanctified on our Lord's Table by the Ministry of the Priests, are CHANGED by* "the ineffable Operation, wonderful and incomprehensible Power of God into" "the Essence of the Body of our Lord, adds farther, Behold here the Faith" "which the Church dispersed throughout the whole World, which is called Catho-  
"lick, has held in all Ages and does at this time hold, and that he confidently re-  
"peats this in the twenty second Chapter, and presses Berengarius to inform  
"himself of the Sentiments of all the Christians in the World in the East and  
"West. Ask the Greeks, Armenians, and generally all Christians of what Nation  
soever, and they will all of them tell you they hold the same Faith which we profess.  
We need but only read to be satisfied that the Author of the *Perpetuity* produces afterwards the Testimony of *Guitmond* in the same Sence, and for the same end he cited that of *Lanfranc*, to wit, to prove that the Greeks and other Schismaticks do believe Transubstantiation, and that in the twenty second Page he makes this remark, *That Guitmond does not only apply what he say's to the Opinion which is contrary to the Real Presence, but likewise to the Doctrine of the impanation which is that of the Lutherans*, which clearly shews us, that this Testimony of *Guitmond* respects not only the Real Presence, but likewise Transubstantiation. In fine, to be ascertained in this matter we need but read what the Author of the *Perpetuity* immediately adds in his twenty third Page, after he had alledged that passage of *Guitmond*: *All the Books of the Schismatical Greeks, say's he, which have come to our hands since that time, do clearly testify they held the same Opinions as the Church of Rome, touching the Eucharist.* After this Mr. *Arnaud* comes and tells us, *that although the Author of the Perpetuity speaks only in his first Treatise of the Real Presence, and contents himself with asserting that this Doctrine was held by all these Schismatical Churches, Yet Mr. Claude turns aside the Question upon Transubstantion, which Point this Author does not precisely Treat of.* What means then I pray these Quotations out of *Lanfranc* and

and *Guitmond* which he has expressly produc'd to shew that Transubstantiation was believed by the whole World, both by the *Greeks* and *Armenians*, and generally by all Christians? Certainly Mr. *Arnaud* does himself an irreparable Injury thus to maintain things without consulting and examining them, flattering himself with the hopes of being believed upon his own bare word. That which has deceiv'd him without doubt has been this: That he has observed in the Treatise of the *Perpetuity*, that the Author having produced his Argument touching the Schismatical Churches in the manner already mention'd, that is to say positively, in reference to Transubstantiation, passing afterwards to the proposing of some Arguments; by which he pretends to shew that the Mystery of the Eucharist is distinctly known by all the Faithful, and that an insensible change is a thing impossible, he restrains himself to the Real Presence, but there is a difference betwixt these two points, and Mr. *Arnaud* ought to have considered this a little better. I say then, that in this Dispute of the *Greeks* and other Christians separated from the *Roman* Church, the question concerns Transubstantiation, and not the Real Presence, as well for that the Author of the *Perpetuity* has expressly mentioned Transubstantiation in his first Treatise as I come now from observing, and for as much as I plainly kept my self in my first Answer to this Doctrine alone, and that of the Adoration, whereupon it follows that the Debate has been precisely continued on these two Articles. Yet do I here declare, to avoid all Mistakes, that altho our debate at present is not concerning the Real Presence, yet do I not yield to the drawing of this consequence from hence, that I acknowledge this Doctrine is believed in the Greek Church, in the same Sense as the *Latins* understand it. This is not my Opinion, and I shall say no more of it, but that this point is not the Subject of our present debate. It will appear perhaps in the following parts of this Discourse, what ought to be believed touching this matter, it not being needful for this to alter the State of our question.

BUT besides the Observations I now made, we must likewise observe, that it does not concern us to know whether the *Greeks* do expressly reject Transubstantiation, or whether they have made it a point of Controversie betwixt them and the *Latins*, but the question here is whether they do positively believe it or no. For there is a great deal of difference between Peoples absolute rejecting of a Doctrine, that is to say, the making thereof a point of debate, and the not receiving and reckoning it amongst the Articles of their Faith. Our debate concerns only this last, I mean whether the *Greek* Church as it stands separate from the *Latin* professes the Doctrine of the Substantial Conversion, or not: This is the true state of the question. Mr. *Arnaud* maintains the affirmative, and I the negative, so that we must see now who has the reason and truth on his side. Yet let me tell him, that designing throly to handle this Subject, he ought to have laid down all these distinctions and leave the Reader at his own liberty to judge of them. But instead of this, there is never a one of these Articles which I now mention'd that he has not manifestly perverted. 1. He makes advantage of all those Parties which have been made from time to time, either by the Violence and Authority of the *Greek* Emperors, or by the Intrigues of the *Latins* for the Re-union of the two Churches. 2. He makes use of the Testimony of Persons won to the *Roman* Interest, such as *Emanuel Calecas*, *Bessarion*, *Fohn Plusiadenus*, *Gennadius Scholarius*, *Baronius Spatarius*, *Paysius*, *Ligaridius*, all of 'em Persons manifestly engaged in the Opinions of the Church of *Rome*, as shall be shewed him in the Sequel of this debate. 3. He sets himself upon proving to no purpose, that the

Q

Greeks





fed in Languages, who has not only voyaged into *Greece* and other *Eastern* Parts, but has lived there a considerable time, and publickly Preached in the *Greek* Churches. For in one of his Letters he sent me, and out of which I shall produce hereafter some Articles, he assures me he has carefully read several publick Writings of the *Greeks*, as their Symbols, Confessions, and Catechisms, to see whether he could find the Term of Transubstantiation in them, which he could not find in any of them. He farther adds, that one of these false *Greeks* which the *Latins* make use of for the propogating of their Doctrines in these Countries, having compiled a Catechism, wherein he had inserted the Term of Transubstantiation, he was censured for it by the true *Greeks*. But all these Testimonies are not necessary, seeing we may read a great many of these authentick Pieces of the *Greeks*, as their Canons collected by *Balsamon*, *Zonaras*, and several others, part of their Liturgies inserted in the Library of the Fathers, their *Euchology* given us by *James Goar* a *Dominicain*, their *Pontificia* published by Mr. *Habert* Bishop of *Vannes*, the Confession of Faith which their Prelats make at the time of their Ordination, the *Typick*, that is to say, the Book that regulates every days Office, with their Festivals, Fasts and Solemnities, their *Anthology* which particularly contains the Offices for Festivals, their Horologies consisting of daily Prayers and many other Ecclesiastical Books, a great number of which we find in the dissertation *Leo Allatius* wrote on this Subject. Mr. *Arnaud* who has made an exact search by himself and Friends, cannot produce one passage that bears the expression of Transubstantiation, which in my judgment is an evident token that 'tis not in them. We may see likewise the Books of their most approved Authors, as of *John Damascene*, *Nicephorus* the Patriarch of *Constantinople*, *Photius*, *Theophylact*, *Oecumenius*, *Zonaras*, *Germain*, *Balsamon*, *Nicetas Choniatus*, *Cabasilas*, *Marc of Ephesus*, *Seremias* the Patriarch, *Metrophanus*, and as many others whose works are extant, in which we find no such expression as answers that of Transubstantiation. Neither can it be said, that this expression being new and found out but since the Contest with *Berengarius*, the *Greeks* have therefore no such word in their Language whereby perfectly to express this, seeing they have the term *μετεσώσις*, which signifies properly Transubstantiation. We have already seen that *Arcudius*, and *Paysius Ligaridius*, have observed it, in effect the *Latinis'd Greeks* do commonly use it, and it was ever inserted in the Formulary of Abjuration, which the *Greeks* make, when they embrace the *Romish* Religion, as I shall make it appear hereafter. And Mr. *Arnaud* himself has been forced to acknowledge, this word *μετεσώσις*, is not that which the *Greeks* ordinarily use whereby to explain Transubstantiation. He should have said they used it not in the explication of their Creed. Moreover he needed not insert the word, *Ordinarily*, for 'tis certain they do neither use it ordinarily nor extraordinarily.

Lib. 4: c. 6.  
pag. 387.

BUT it may be perhaps replied, It does not follow that they do not believe with the *Latins* the Doctrine represented under this Term, altho they use not the Term it self. I answer first, that if we suppose the *Greeks* ever held this Opinion, as Mr. *Arnaud* would perswade us, there could not be any reason given why the word *μετεσώσις* has not been found all this while in use amongst their Authors, and so much the more because we find that of *σώσις* & *σώω* in them. For the *Latins* who had not in common use either the Term of *Substantiatio*, nor *Substantiare*, have therefore invented and admitted of that of *Transubstantiatio*, and *Transubstantiare*, as most proper to express their conceptions on that Subject, so that this very consideration, That we find not

these kind of expressions in the Writings of the Greeks, is a kind of proof that they believed not the thing signified by them. Moreover, the *Latins* having Invented the Term of *Transubstantiation*; how comes it to pass the Greeks have not all this while, following their example used that of *μετεσώμας*, to keep up this perfect Conformity with the Church of *Rome*, which Mr. *Arnaud* has all along supposed? How comes it to pass that when this Greek word has been known to 'em, and even the *Latins* themselves have taught it them, yet they would not admit of it? and I pray, what ill conveniencies could they apprehend thereby, if they in effect believed the conversion of the Substances? It cannot appear strange to us, that there were heretofore Persons of sound Judgments, who scrupled to admit the term of *Hypostasis*, because that in effect ignorant people would take thence occasion to imagine, there were several Divinities; but there can be nothing like this alledged in respect of *Transubstantiation*, for there is no danger of giving this an excessive sence, beyond what ought to be believed, supposing we admit the Substantial conversion. There is rather on the contrary, a kind of necessity to make use of it, because it expresses better than any other this kind of conversion, and the Terms, *μετέωλον*, *μεταποίησις*, *μετασχηματισμός*, being general expressions are consequently defective, and suffer a man to deny the change in question, and fall into Heresie; which is as much the Greeks interest as the *Latins* to prevent, if it were so they had the same Sentiments in this Subject with them, as Mr. *Arnaud* assures us they have. He mightily bestirs himself with his Arguments, or rather Declamations on that the Greeks have never quarrelled about this Doctrine, and finds it strange supposing they were of a contrary belief to the *Latins*. But let him then tell us, wherefore they so obstinately refused to use the word *μετεσώμας*, *Transubstantiation*, and would never express themselves on this Mystery in the same form as the Church of *Rome*; for I find this far more strange, supposing they hold in the main the same Doctrine with her. It cannot be alledged that their ignorance has hind'ed them from finding so proper a Term; for it has been made to their hands, or that they feared thereby to offend their Emperours; seeing they were deeply engaged to favour the Church of *Rome*, or feared thereby to incur a greater hatred from the *Latins*, seeing they could not do 'em a greater pleasure.

HOW comes it then to pass, they never used it, but on the contrary, when the *Latins* in these forc'd and interess'd Unions I mentioned in the preceding Book, have propos'd to them the Article of the Eucharist under the Term of *Transubstantiatur*, the Bread is transubstantiated; they kept to their general expressions, saying, only *μετεβάλλεται*, the Bread is changed, as I shall hereafter make appear? Is not this an evident Testimony they would not adopt a Doctrine unknown to their Church, and which they regarded as a Novelty?

THIS first Proof shall be upheld by a second of no less strength than the former. Being taken from that the *Greeks* in the explicating of their belief on the Eucharist, not only do not use the Term of *Transubstantiation*, but whatsoever Terms they make use of, they signifie not any thing which expressly bears the real conversion of the Substance Bread of and Wine into that of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ. When Pope *Gregory*, towards the end of the Eleventh Century was minded to shew what his belief was on this Subject; he did not indeed use the Term of *Transubstantiation*, because 'twas not then found out, but explained himself in such a manner as was sufficiently clear and intelligible.

intelligible. *The Bread and Wine, say's he, on the Altar are changed substanti- Mr. Arnaud ally by virtue of the mystical and sacred Orison, and words of our Redeemer, in- lib. 2. cb. 8. p. 170. to the true, proper, and lively Flesh, and real, proper, and lively Blood of Fesus Christ our Lord, and after the consecration 'tis the true Body of Fesus Christ, born of the Virgin Mary, and the real Blood which ran down his side, not only in a sign, and by vertue of a Sacrament, but by propriety of nature, and reality of substance.*

WHEN *Innocent the Third* would have this same belief known in the Council of *Latran*, he clearly explain'd himself, and made use even of the very Term of *Transubstantiation*. *In the Sacrament of the Altar, faith he, the Body and Blood of Fesus Christ are really contained under the Species of Bread and Wine, the Bread being transubstantiated into the Body, and the Wine into the blood, by the divine power. In the same manner was it in the Council of Trent, which expressly declared their belief, and what they would have others believe likewise. There is made, say they, by the consecration, a conversion of the whole Substance of Bread into the Substance of the Body of our Lord Fesus Christ, and of the whole Substance of the Wine into the Substance of his Blood, which conversion is rightly and properly called Transubstantiation.* Cncil. Lat. Sub Innoc. 3. cap. 1. Sess. 13. cap. 4.

AND thus speak the Doctors of the Church of *Rome*, and thus in effect they ought to express themselves for the forming the *Idea* of this Doctrine. But 'tis otherwise with the *Greeks*: for besides what I said, that they use not the Term of *μετεσώσεις*, but reject it, it will not be found they use any expressions which come near them of the Church of *Rome*, or mention any thing relating to a substantial conversion, or presence of substance under the accidents of Bread and Wine, or change of one substance into another, which is what ought to be said, to shew they believed *Transubstantiation*. We see not any thing of this kind appear in the *Cannons* of their Councils, *Confessions* of Faith, or *Liturgies*, *Books* of Devotions, or any of their Writings, whether published by their Modern or Ancient Divines, and certainly 'tis very strange these people should believe *Transubstantiation*, and yet at the same time not so much as declare in express Terms this their belief. For besides, that these Terms are but few and easie to be found out; there being nothing more easie to a man who believes the Substantial conversion, than to say, *the Bread is substantially converted into the Body of Fesus Christ, or the substance of Bread is really changed into the substance of Christ's Body, in such a manner that the former substance remains no more.* Besides this, I say, they have in the Greek Language words which answer exactly the expressions of the Latins on this subject, and upon this account they would be inexcusable, expressing themselves as they do, differently from the Church of *Rome*, were their belief the same with hers.

YET is it evident, that the expressions of the *Greeks* are no ways like those of the *Latins*, and there needs only the comparing of the one with the other to discern the difference. Compare for Example the confession of *Gregory the Seventh*, with what *Mr. Arnaud* tells us concerning *Nicetas Pectoratus* and *Theophilact*. Compare the Discourses of *Urban the Second* in the Council of *Plaisance*, of *Innocent the Third* in the Council of *Latran*, of *Thomas Aquinas*, and all the School-men, and in short of the Council of *Trent*, with what he alledgeth out of *Euthymius*, *Nicholas Methoniensis*, *Zonaras*, *Nicetas Choniatus*, *Casasilas* and *Feremias*; and you'll find on the one hand the conversion of the Substances clearly and plainly expressed, and on the other no such thing.

I have



I have already mentioned Mr. *Basire* an English Divine, who had a particular Commerce with the *Greeks*, and during the time he was amongst them carefully applied himself to the reading of their Books; observe here then what he wrote me from *Durham* Decemb. 6. 1668. *Dico 3. in specie Ecclesiam Græcam, Transubstantiationem nullibi asserere, neque voce, neque re. De publicis instrumentis, puta Symbolis, confessionibus, catechismis, &c. intelligi volo; quorum plurima pervolvi ad indaginem, neque in eorum vel unico, μὴ δὲ ὡς vocis, ut & rei ipsius, priscis patribus Græcis prorsus ignota, vel vola vel vestigium. Privatos eorum Doctores nil moror, quoniam non sum nescius quemdam ipsorum pseudo-Græcorum hieromonachum in suam catechesin quam mihi videre licuit Constantinopoli, illam vocem μὴ δὲ ὡς intrussisse, qui vel ideo verorum Græcorum censuram haud effugit: The Greek Church does no where teach Transubstantiation. I mean in their publick Symbols, confessions and catechisms, &c. several of which I have upon this account carefully perused, but could not find in any of them the least trace either of this Term of Transubstantiation, or the thing it self signifi'd thereby, which Doctrine was altogether unknown to the Greek Fathers. I matter not some private Doctōrs amongst them, for I know that a certain Monk, of the number of these false Greeks, had secretly inserted the Term of μὴ δὲ ὡς Transubstantiation in his Catechism, which I saw at Constantinople, but he was severely checkt for it by the true Greeks. It will be perhaps replied, that Mr. *Basire* is a Protestant, and consequently to be suspected in this case; but besides that he is a person deservedly honoured for his integrity, and whose testimony cannot be question'd without the highest injustice, and moreover a Divine, and therefore not likely to mistake in things relating to his own Profession, being a person of great Learning, and one that dwelt long in those Parts, and had not only the curiosity, but likewise the means and opportunities to inform himself exactly in the truth of what he relates; besides this, I say, Mr. *Arnaud* cannot justly reject his Testimony upon this only ground, that he is a Protestant; seeing he himself has produc'd the Letters of Mr. *Pomponne* his Nephew, and Mr. *Picquet*, and the History of what passed at *M.* the Archbishop of *Sens*, touching the Muscovits attested by Roman Catholics.*

BUT should I lay aside Mr. *Basire's* testimony, that of Mr. *Arnaud* would serve my turn. I suppose there's no body doubts, but that Mr. *Arnaud* has made all possible search into these matters touching the *Greeks*, and 'tis certain, had he found any passages containing in express Terms the Doctrine of Transubstantiation, he would not omit them. Yet it is evident that whatsoever he has hitherto alledged, which seems to intimate the conversion of Substances, in all this long dispute which takes up half his Book, is but a meer Sophism, imposing on us by means of the reunion made between the *Greeks* and *Latins* by *Michael Paleologus*, and some testimonies the ancientest of which bears date but from the year, 1641. We shall examine these matters in their proper place, and hope to undeceive mens Minds whatsoever impressions they may have made upon them. In the mean time we may observe that instead of giving us express and clear proofs, which are the only ones that can lawfully be produced on this subject, he amuses his Readers with tedious Discourses, wide Consequences, and negative Arguments, which at bottom conclude nothing. For the Point in question relating to a Fact which ought to be decided by proofs of Fact, we expect thereupon Testimonies conclusive in themselves without the help of Mr. *Arnaud*, and the impossibility

possibility wherein he has found himself of satisfying the publick expectation, is in it self an evident proof of the contrary of what he pretends. But this will appear yet more plain by what follows in the next Chapter, wherein we shall more fully discover Mr. Arnaud's imposing on the World.

### CHAP. III.

*The Third Proof taken from that the Expressions used by the Greeks are general, and insufficient to form the Idea of a substantial Conversion. The Fourth, that the Greeks only receive for Determinations of Faith, the Decrees of the seven first General Councils. The remaining part of Mr. Arnaud's Delusion laid open. The Fifth Proof taken from that the Greeks in their Transactions with the Latins have ever kept to their General Expressions. Mr. Arnaud's Eighth Delusion discovered.*

**T**HE Common Expressions the Greeks use in the explaining their Belief touching the Mystery of the *Eucharist*, are these. They call the Symbols, *the holy gifts, the holy things, the ineffable mysteries, the body and blood of Jesus Christ, the sanctified bread, the particle or parts, the pearl, and the like.* They say, *that the Bread is the Body of Jesus Christ, that it is made the Body of Jesus Christ, that 'tis changed into the Body of Jesus Christ, that 'tis the real Body of Jesus Christ.*

AND to exprefs this change, they use the Terms of μεταλλάξιν, μεταρρυθμιζίν, μεταποιεζίν, μεταποιεζίν, μετασκευάζιν, which signifie, *to change.* Now 'tis certain these expressions, whether we take 'em severally, or joyntly, cannot form the Idea of Transubstantiation. For, besides that being general, they are capable of several particular senses, and are found indifferently used on other Subjects wherein there is no Transubstantiation imagined, as may be justified by a thousand Examples, if it were needful; besides this, I say, our reason guides us never to attribute a particular and determinate sense to persons who explain not themselves otherwise than in general Terms, unless it evidently appears from something else, that they had this particular sense in their minds.

I confess that in this case, that is to say, if it appears they have had a particular sense in their minds, we ought readily to take their Terms in this sense, how general soever they may be, but if they come not up to this, we can give them no more than a general and undeterminate meaning. We know for example, that in the Church of Rome Transubstantiation is commonly believed, when then we are told, *that the Bread is made the Body of Jesus Christ, or that 'tis changed into the Body of Christ*; although these words are general, yet do we immediately understand them in this particular sense, that the Bread is changed substantially into the Body of Christ. But had she not elsewhere expressed her self touching the change of the Substance, and

and had no Council defined it, nor were it to be found in the Confessions of Faith, Catechisms, and other Publick Books, and taught by the Roman Doctours, it is evident we should be unreasonable, in giving these general expressions any other than a general sense, and this generality it self would be an invincible Argument that she never descended so far as the distinct determination of Transubstantiation, and consequently this would not be an Article of her Belief. Now 'tis after this manner we ought to judge of the *Greek Church*, all its expressions are general, there appearing nothing elsewhere which determines this generality, or which engages us to attribute to her the particular and distinct sense of the Church of *Rome*, and whatsoever Mr. *Arnaud* has alledged in the behalf of this, is of no weight. It then necessarily follows, that we ought to attribute to her no other than a general sense, and in no wise that of Transubstantiation, which is evidently particular and determinate: And even this consideration, that they of the Church of *Rome* are obliged to use Arguments to explain the common expressions of this Church into a sense of Transubstantiation, is an infallible mark that she does not believe it.

NOW seeing this Proof is decisive, and that it not only establisheth my Sentiment, but likewise overthrows Mr. *Arnaud's* whole dispute, it will not be therefore amiss to illustrate it and consider well its Foundations, to the end it may be manifested whether the conclusion I draw from hence is just and true. First, then we must know that Transubstantiation is the precise and distinct determination of the manner in which the Bread is made the Body of Christ, to wit, by a real conversion of the substance of this Bread into the substance of this Body; so that 'tis impossible to believe it without forming a distinct *Idea* after this manner, seeing it is even this precise and determin'd *Idea* it self. It is then absurd and contradictory to look for it in a general and confused *Idea*, which determines nothing, for this is to seek for a determination in a thing undetermined, and a distinct sense in a generality, that is to say, light in darkness. And from hence appears what must be the expressions of a Church which believes Transubstantiation, and teaches it, for it is necessary she teach it in plain terms, which answer the distinct *Idea* she has of it, and which may immediately form the like in the minds of those that hear her. Now this cannot be done but by express and formal Terms, or by Terms so equivalent, that they cannot be turned into a contrary sense. What I say is verifi'd by the example of the Roman Church, whose expressions are plain and clear, and which immediately shew her meaning.

MOREOVER we should consider that the Notion of Transubstantiation is not one of those which are called Speculative, but Practical Notions, which engages them that have it to several duties and performances, and especially to the sovereign adoration of this same substance, which before was the substance of bread, but now the same proper numerical substance of the natural body of Jesus Christ, as speaks the Church of *Rome*, whence it necessarily follows, that a Church which thus believes it, teacheth it in such a manner, that the act of adoration follows freely and naturally of it self.

IT is likewise to be observed, that the matter here in hand concerns the *Greek Church* from the Eleventh Century, which is to say, that since the contests with *Berengarius*, the *Roman Church* has expressly determined the substantial conversion, which drove the *Greeks* into a greater necessity of speaking



speaking clearly on this point, either to shew their conformity of belief with the *Latins*, or to avoid the falling into the same inconveniencies which the *Latins* endeavour'd to avoid by this formal declaration. And this observation is the more considerable against Mr. *Arnaud*, in that he grants the *Greeks* not to have been ignorant of this circumstance touching *Berengarius*.

TO know then certainly whether the *Greek Church* believes Transubstantiation or not, we need but see after what manner she explains her self concerning the *Eucharist*; for if her expressions bear not a substantial conversion, either expressly or equivalently, in such a sort, that they may easily and immediately form the notion thereof, if they be I say general, and determine nothing of themselves, it is a certain proof she does not believe it, for that Church which believes it, and would have its Children do the like, cannot but explain it self clearly and fully on that subject. If we examine Mr. *Arnaud's* dispute on this Principle, which I esteem as the light of common sense, we shall immediately deprive him of all his negative Arguments, taken from the silence of the *Greeks*, and that of the *Latins*; for altho these kind of Arguments are very good in other occasions, yet it is apparent that to end a question, such a one as this is, which is, Whether the Eastern Church believes and teaches Transubstantiation, Mr. *Arnaud* should have taken a course more decisive than that of considering what the *Greeks* have done in relation to the Transubstantiation of the *Latins*, or what the *Latins* have done in respect of the belief of the *Greeks*. It were better for us, directly to consider, after what manner, they themselves do positively explain their belief, touching the *Eucharist*. If we find Transubstantiation plainly declared in it; these Arguments of silence are no longer necessary, and if we don't find it clearly expressed, there will follow a Conclusion so greatly to my advantage, that all Mr. *Arnaud's* negative Arguments will not be able to subsist before it, for there is a thousand times more solidity in reasoning after this sort. A Church doth not clearly teach Transubstantiation, therefore she holds it not, than to argue thus; A Church does not oppose Transubstantiation held by the *Latins*, therefore she believes it. Besides that the first Argument concludes directly and immediately what the other does not, there is a greater coherence between believing Transubstantiation, and clearly teaching it, than there is repugnance between not believing it. and yet not opposing it in persons who do believe it. There is no reason can hinder the *Greeks* from distinctly teaching Transubstantiation, supposing they believed it, but there may be several reasons which may oblige them from making this Point a matter of dispute with the *Latins*, altho they do not believe it.

NEITHER must the Profession of Faith, which the Emperour *Michael Paleologus* sent (as from the *Greeks*) to Pope *John* the XXI. to finish the work of the Re-union of the two Churches be made use of against us; for besides that this was an act extorted by force, which is not of any account amongst the *Greeks*, we do not find that the *Latin* expressions which bear that the Bread is really transubstantiated, do exactly answer the *Greek* expressions of the same act, which according to all likelihood contained only, that the Bread is really changed, as we shall make it appear hereafter.

NEITHER are the Attestations and particular Testimonies which are but from the year 1641. to be urged against us, for not to alledge that these pieces are apparently the fruit of the Emissaries and Seminaries, and that

the quality of the Persons who make these attestations, does not furnish them with sufficient Authority to decide our question, which concerns the body of the *Greek* Schismatical Church, all these pieces are too new whereon to build alone; a Tradition from the Eleventh Century, that is to say, since six hundred years.

WE may then already see in general that Mr. *Arnaud's* whole dispute is reduced to consequences, which will be easily overthrown by a particular examination of them, which shall be done in its place; but in the mean time what I already said is sufficient to establish the validity of my Argument, which is drawn, from that the usual expressions of the *Greeks*, I mean the clearest of them, and those which the Church of *Rome* believes to be most favourable to her upon the account of the *Eucharist*, only consist in general terms. Whence I conclude they hold not Transubstantiation; for there is nothing more opposite to this Doctrine than general expressions, seeing the belief of the substantial conversion, as I have already established it, is in itself the particular and distinct determination of the manner of the Bread's being made or changed into the Body of Jesus Christ, and that 'tis not possible but that a Church which believes it, and would instruct its people in this Doctrine must explain this Point clearly and distinctly: And thus in strengthening my own Arguments, I lay open the weakness of Mr. *Arnaud's*.

BUT this Argument I now produced, ought to be attended by this following consideration, which will farther evidence its strength and solidity. Which is that the *Greeks* profess to receive only for the determinations of Points of Faith, the seven first general Councils, to wit, that of *Nice*, against *Arius* under the Emperour *Constantine* the Great, that at *Constantinople* against *Macedonius* under *Theodosius*, that of *Ephesus* against *Nestorius* under *Theodosius Junior*, that of *Chalcedon* against *Eutychus* and *Dioscorus* under *Marcion*, that of *Constantinople* upon occasion of the quarrel of the three Chapters under the Emperour *Fustinian*, the third of *Constantinople* against the *Monothelites* under *Constantine Pogonatus*, and in fine the second of *Nice* on the subject of Images under *Constantine*, and his Mother *Irena*. Now 'tis certain, there is nothing in all these Councils which determines Transubstantiation, for what is produced concerning the first at *Nice*; That we must conceive by Faith, that the Lamb of God that takes away the sins of the World, lies on this holy Table, that he is sacrificed without a sacrifice by the Priests, and that we do really receive his precious Body and Blood: This I say, as any man may see, is not Transubstantiation no more than what is offered us touching the second at *Nice*, as will appear by reading the fifth Chapter of Mr. *Arnaud's* seventh Book, wherein he relates it. And as to these Councils by which the Church of *Rome* has determin'd the conversion of the Substances, as that of *Gregory* the Seventh, held at *Rome* in the year 1079. that of *Plaisance* held in the year 1095. under *Urban* the Second, that of *Latlan* in the year 1215. wherein *Innocent* the Third declared the Doctrine of his Church on this Subject, that of *Constance* assembled in the year 1414. wherein *Wicliff* was condemned for opposing this Doctrine, and in fine that of *Trent*, which established the preceding decisions, the *Greek* Church receives none of these, nor makes any account of them. They all commonly say, say's *Richardus* the Jesuit, in his relation of the Isle of *St. Erins*, that the Decrees of the seven first Councils ought only to be observed, and the Priests make the people believe, that at the end of the seventh Council, an Angel descended from Heaven; testifying that whatsoever concerned our Faith, was therein perfected, and there remain'd

main'd nothing more to be added or decided. *Leo Allatius* likewise only mentions seven Councils which they approve. They have, say's he, in great esteem *Allat. de the Decrees of the seven first general Councils, and hold them inviolable, they* *prep. consil. 1. cap. 9.* receive their Canons for their Rule in all things, and the most Religious amongst them do constantly observe them.

*ALEXANDER Guaguin* discoursing of the Religion of the *Russians*, *Guag. in* which is the same as that of the *Greeks*, relates their Belief is, that 'twas concluded in the seventh general Council, that the matters determin'd in the preceding Councils should remain firm for the time to come, and that there should no other Council be called under the penalty of an *Anathema*; wherefore (adds he) they say, that all the Councils and Synods held since the seven first, are accursed, perverse, and desperately defiled with Heresie. *Sacranus Chanon of Cracovia*, tells us likewise, that they regard not any of those Councils which have been held since the seventh, saying, they are not concerned in them, seeing they were held without their consent. *Mose. descript. Relig. Russeni. art. 3.*

*SCARGA* the Jesuit sets down this as their sixth Errour, that there ought only the seven Councils to be regarded, and that whosoever receives the Decrees of an eighth or ninth is accursed. *Mr. Basire*, whom I mentioned in the foregoing Chapter, confirms me in this matter by his Letter. In publica, say's he, *Græcorum professione, non nisi ἐν τῇ συνόδῳ recipiunt quas ὁικουμενικὰς nuncupant.* In the publick confession of their Faith they only receive the Decrees of the seven Councils which they call *Oecumenical*. And *Metrophanus* the Patriarch of *Alexandria* authorises all these Testimonies by his express Declaration: *We only receive, say's he, the seven Oecumenical Councils, and as to the particular Councils, we receive from them what has been received and confirmed by the seven Oecumenical ones.* Should I conclude from hence they hold not Transubstantiation for an Article of their Faith, this conclusion perhaps would not be contemptible, for in fine not to receive for a determination of Faith any thing else but what is contained in the seven first Councils, and at the same time to believe the Doctrine of the substantial conversion, are two things very inconsistent with each other, especially in reference to people that utterly reject the other Councils, wherein this Doctrine has been determin'd. And in effect, it seems to me that this Doctrine is important enough to be inserted amongst the Articles of their Faith already decided or confirmed by Councils, and not amongst the common customs, or practices which are still observed, altho not expressly determined, or amongst the Points, which being minute and inconsiderable, are therefore left undecided, altho they are held. Let the Reader judge, whether 'tis likely a Church would only receive for a determination of Points of Faith the Decrees of Councils, wherein there has passed not a word concerning Transubstantiation, and reject others wherein Transubstantiation has been established, and yet believe this Doctrine as firmly as the *Latins*, and not dare to explain her self in clear and proper terms, which would have eased *Mr. Arnaud* of that great pains he has taken to fill three or four large Books with his long Syllogisms, the greatest part of which are besides the purpose. What mean these *Greeks* by their general expressions, which are good for nothing but to puzzle people? For according to *Mr. Arnaud*, they distinctly believe the whole substance of Bread is changed into the substance of our Saviour's Body, and teach as they believe, it being their interest to do so, to the end this Doctrin may prevail with the people to adore this substance when changed. They are not ignorant of the manner after which the Church of



Rome explains it self touching this Doctrine. And yet are they obliged not to receive any Doctrine as an Article of Faith, but what has been already determined by the seven first Councils, in which there's no mention of this *Change of Substance*, and to reject all those Councils which expressly decreed it, and nevertheless they express themselves in general terms, which signifie nothing. And must Mr. *Arnaud* (to whose immortal praise the *Greeks* are still in the World, and to whom they are obliged for their preservation under the Turkish Empire) tire himself, his Friends, and his Readers; exhaust his store of Consequences, that is to say, his stock of Delusions, and be continually employing his invention to find some appearance or shadow of Transubstantiation in the usual expressions of this People? To speak impartially, he has reason to be angry with these *Greeks*, who are so obstinate, or at least so lazy, that they will not be at the pains to express plainly, and without ambiguity, a Notion so clearly and distinctly imprinted in their minds. And moreover not only these *Greeks* have not explained themselves; but even when moved by temporal interests and the politick intrigues of their Emperours they consented to these patched re-unions with the Church of *Rome*, they have changed the Latin expressions, and whereas in the Acts of these last, it is expressly mention'd; that the Bread is Transubstantiated into the Body of Jesus Christ, they have barely inserted, that it is changed, that 'tis consecrated, and in a word, they have ever substituted their general expressions, to the formal and precise expressions of the *Latins*. What can Mr. *Arnaud* alledge, when on one hand he sees in *Raynaldus*, this Confession of Faith, about which he has made such a noise, and which was offer'd to the *Greeks* by *Clement IV.* by *Gregory X.* by *Fohn XXI.* and by *Urban V.* as distinctly and clearly containing the Belief of the Roman Church, and that he sees it, I say, expressed in these *Latins* words, *Sacramentum Eucharistiae ex azymo conficit eadem Romana Ecclesia, tenens & docens quod in ipso Sacramento Panis verè Transubstantiatur in Corpus, & Vinum in Sanguinem Domini nostri Jesu Christi.* The Church of *Rome* celebrates the Sacrament of the Eucharist with unleavened Bread, holding and teaching that in this Sacrament the Bread is really transubstantiated into the Body and the Wine into the Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ; and when on the other hand he finds this same Article in the Greek Copy produced by *Allatius* in these Words, Τὸ μυστήριον τῆς εὐχαριστίας ἔστι ἀζύμους ὑποστάζειν ἢ περιποιεῖται ἐκ αὐτῶν ἐκκλησία καὶ διδάσκει τὸ εὐχαριστία, ὅτι ἐν αὐτῇ τὰ μυστήρια, ὁ ἀληθὺς μετεβάλλεται εἰς σῶμα, καὶ ὁ οἶνος εἰς αἷμα τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ. The Church of *Rome* celebrates the Sacrament of the Eucharist with unleavened Bread, holding and teaching that in this Sacrament the Bread is really changed into the Body, and the Wine into the Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ. The *Latins* say's, verè Transubstantiatur, it is really Transubstantiated, and the *Greeks* ἀληθὺς μεταβάλλεται, it is really changed.

*Raynald. ad  
ann. 1267.  
num. 77.*

*Allat. perp.  
conf. lib. 2, cap.  
17.*

*Liv. 3. cap. 7.  
pag. 298.*

Mr. *Arnaud*, who loves not to complain, when his complaints will do him no good, passes lightly over this difference, as if it were a trifle not worth his notice, for having told us, that *Raynaldus* observes, some read in Latin *Transmutatur*, and others *Transubstantiatur*, he adds, *Allatius* who has given us the Original it self, makes it appear that these words, *Transmutatur* and *Transubstantiatur*, are mere Synonymous Terms, seeing they have been substituted by Interpreters to these Greek words, ἐν αὐτῇ τὰ μυστήρια ὁ ἀληθὺς μετεβάλλεται, &c. And this is what is soon dispatched by the Rule of Synonymy, *Transmutatur*, and *Transubstantiatur* are both the same, because Interpreters substitute both one and the other of these words to the Term μεταβάλλεται.

βέβαιαι. But who are these Interpreters, who thus render *Transubstantiatur*, are they not such who find *Transubstantiation* every where, and will have it brought into the Greek Church by force? If *Transmutare* and *Transubstantiare* are Synonymous Terms, Mr. Arnaud may when he pleases render those words of Gregory Nazianzen, *Christo indutus sum, in Christo Transubstantiatus sum*, for there is *Transmutatus*, and when he shall find in a Homily attributed to Origen, *Sanctus Theologus in Deum Transmutatus*, he may read, *in Deum Transubstantiatus*; and when he reads in St. Irèneus Oclester, *Transmutatur in bonam olivam*, he may render this, *Transubstantiatur in bonam olivam*. Gregor. Naz. Ora. 40. Hom. 2. in dis. vers. Irén. ad Hæres. lib. 5. cap. 12. If we may as well substitute to the Greek word *μεταβάλλειν*, these two Latin ones, *Transmutatur* and *Transubstantiatur*, Mr. Arnaud may read in the Version of St. Macarius, *omnes in naturam Divinam Transubstantiantur*, for the Interpreter has set down *Transmutantur*, and the Greek imports *μεταβάλλουσι*, and when he shall find in the same Author, *that Jesus Christ came to change the nature*, he may understand it, that he came to *Transubstantiate the nature*, forasmuch as the Latin bears *Transmutare*, and the Greek *μεταβάλλειν*. 'Tis certain that a man who reads good Authors upon Mr. Arnaud's credit, and follows his Synonyma's, will make abundance of extravagant Transubstantiations, and I do not believe Mr. Arnaud will be willing to warrant them all. He will say these words are Synonymy's, when they concern the *Eucharist*; for the Bread's being *Changed* or *Transubstantiated*, is the same thing. It is so indeed with them that believe Transubstantiation, but not with them who do not believe it. But the Greeks believe it, say's Mr. Arnaud, which he is obliged to prove before he affirms it. Mr. Arnaud's Arguments are really admirable, for they are very conclusive, provided we suppose the truth of what they conclude. If it be demanded of him wherefore he makes such a noise with this Form of Faith, he will answer 'tis because the Term of *Transubstantiatur* is in it. Tell him that in the Greek there is *μεταβάλλειν*, *Transmutatur* and not *Transubstantiatur*, he will answer that *μεταβάλλειν*, *Transmutatur* and *Transubstantiatur* are the same thing. But let this be examined, it will be found to be indeed the same thing to them that believe Transubstantiation, but as to others who do not, there is a great difference; so that to speak truly, to make Mr. Arnaud's Argument good, it must first be supposed the Greeks believe the *Substantial Conversion*, as well as the *Latins*.

HE may adjust these matters when he pleases; but let me tell him in the mean time, that the Greeks used the same expressions in the Council of Florence. The Latins having demanded wherefore after the words of our Saviour Jesus Christ, *take, eat, this is my Body, which has been broken for you, for the Remission of your Sins, &c.* (they added this Prayer,) *and make this Bread the precious Body of thy Christ, and that which is in this Cup, the precious blood of thy Christ, in changing them by virtue of thy Holy Spirit*; they answered they did acknowledge that the Consecrated Bread was made the Body of Christ by these words. The Latin Decree has this expression, *fateri nos diximus per hæc verba Transubstantiari Sacrum Panem, & fieri Corpus Christi*, but the Greek expressions are these, *ἡμεῖς ἀπομὲν ὅτι ὁμολογῶμεν διὰ τῶν ρημάτων τῶντων τελεῖσθαι τὸ σῶν ἄρτον καὶ γίνεσθαι ὁλόκαυρον*, The Latin say's 'tis *Transubstantiated*, the Greek that 'tis *Consecrated*. Concil. Florent. Sess. 25. Lib. 4. cap. 2. pag. 345.

MR. Arnaud has recourse here likewise to his Synonymy's; for he tells us, that the Latins (to whom this answer was made) having taken it in the sense of an acknowledgement of Transubstantiation, it is ridiculous to pretend there

was

was such a great equivocation between them and the Greeks, the one understanding a change of Substance, and the others a change of Virtue. He adds, That if the Greeks had not taken these words in the sense of the Latins, Syropulus, and Marc of Ephesus would have observed that the Latins were derided by this equivocation, and would have accused them who made this answer of prevarication and deceit. In fine, he say's, that Andrew de S. Cruce (who deserves as much to be credited, as any of the other Historians, who wrote on this Council, because he was there present) relates this acknowledgment of Transubstantiation, which Bessarion made in the name of all the Greeks, in a manner more precise, distinct, and with greater circumstances, and that he attributes to him these words, we have learnt that these are the words of our Lord, which Change and Transubstantiate the Bread into the Body of Jesus Christ, and the Wine into his Blood, and that these divine words have the full force of Transubstantiation.

I answer, the more I study the Character of Mr. Arnaud, the more clearly I perceive that these things are no otherwise ridiculous and affrightful, but only as they agree not with his designs. For it is certain that τελεῖσθαι, and Transubstantiari, are two different Terms, which signifie not the same thing; the first is applicable in general to all Mysteries, and signifies only, to be consecrated, or perfectly consecrated; the second signifies a Change of one Substance into another. It is moreover certain, that when the Latins wrote Transubstantiari, the Greeks have only set down τελεῖσθαι, why then will he have it, that the Greeks took not this Term in its natural signification, and in the usual sense given to it amongst them? Because say's he, that the Latins took this answer for an acknowledgment of Transubstantiation: But who told him, that the Latins did not do ill in taking it after this manner; Who told him the Greeks intended the Latins should take it in this sense? The Greeks have kept to their general expressions, and the Latins have drawn them as far as they could to their advantage. If there has been any equivocation in them, the Latins have voluntarily made it, and 'tis very likely, could they have made the Greeks say μὲν τελεῖσθαι, instead of τελεῖσθαι, they would gladly have done it, but not being able to effect it, they have made what advantage they could of τελεῖσθαι, in interpreting it by the word Transubstantiation. And this is the whole Secret, which is neither ridiculous nor affrightful in any other, than Mr. Arnaud's imagination.

And as to what he say's concerning Syropulus, and Mark of Ephesus, namely, that they would have observed the Latins were deluded by an Equivocation, and accuse them who thus answered in behalf of the Greeks of prevarication and deceit; I see no reason they had to do this, for when the Greeks, sayd τελεῖσθαι, they spoke their usual Language and derided no body. If the Latins understood it otherwise than the force of the Term and common use permitted them; 'tis they that derided the Greeks rather than the Greeks them, wherefore there is no reason in this respect to accuse them who made this answer of prevarication and deceit. Andrew de S. Cruce his relating the words of Bessarion according to the intention of the Latins, does but confirm what I say, which is that the Roman Church has ever endeavoured to expound to its advantage the general expressions of the Greeks, and I know not wherefore Mr. Arnaud tells us, that he deserves no less credit than the other Historians, who wrote of this Council. Would he have it, that Bessarion who speaks for all the rest of the Greeks, did not use the Term τελεῖσθαι; This is the very word in the Greek Text concerning that Council, and Andrew de S. Cruce's Authority is not sufficient to correct a Publick Act, neither can his  
Latin



Latin alter the Greek. Would he have it that the *Latins* explain'd the *τελεῖσθαι* of *Bessarion* by *Transubstantiatur*? I grant it, and the Decree of the Council shows it, so that he needs not call *Andrew de St. Cruce* to his assistance. Yet may we observe that Mr. *Arnaud* himself is not fully satisfi'd that the Greek and Latin expressions on this Subject, do mean but one and the same thing, altho he tells us he is; for he calls that which *Andrew de St. Cruce*, relates from *Bessarion*, a more precise manner, more distinct and circumstantial, which is as much as to say after all, that the *Transubstantiari* of the *Latins* is more precise, distinct and plain than the *τελεῖσθαι* of the *Greeks*.

AND this the force of Truth has extorted from him; and it were well if it could likewise so far prevail with him as to make him acknowledge, that this proceeding of the *Greeks* is an evident mark they believed not *Transubstantiation*. For had they believed it, what likelihood is there they should thus carefully keep themselves from using the expressions of the *Latins*, which are proper, distinct and clear, and change them into others, which are general and equivocal, and that in the same Acts wherein those aforementioned exactly describe the conversion of the Substances, th'others should be so obstinate, as not to take notice of it. Had they been perswaded the *Latins* did not innovate, would they not have yielded to a thousand Reasons which seem'd to constrain them to manifest their thro Conformity with them? Their Affairs were in very bad circumstances, they left their Country to implore the assistance of the Western Princes; they were in the Pope's hands, and maintain'd at his charge; they consented to the re-union of the two Churches; their Emperors did not only sollicite but constrain them thereunto; and they had already offered great violences to their own consciences, for they consented to the addition of the *Filioque* in the Creed; what reason then could hinder them from acknowledging the Conversion of the Substances, had their belief been the same with that of the Church of Rome; Wherefore should they still affect their general Terms, of ἀγιάζεσθαι, τελεῖσθαι, μεταβάλλεσθαι; Wherefore even in the very act of the re-union made at Florence, the Term of Transubstantiation was never inserted, but only that of *confici*, in the Latin, and that of τελεῖσθαι in the Greek? For thus was it set down, ἐτι ἐν ἀζύμῳ ἢ ἐν ζύμῳ ἄριστον τὸ τῷ χρυσῷ σῶμα τελεῖσθαι ἀληθῶς, τῶς τε ἱερῆς ἐν πατρίῳ αὐτὸ τὸ σῶμα τῷ χρυσῷ ἐφελθὲν τελεῖν, ἕκαστον διελθόντι τῇ τῆς ἰδίας ἐκκλησίας εἴτε δυτικῆς εἴτε ἀνατολικῆς συνήθειαν. Item in azymo sive fermentato Pane triticeo Corpus Christi veraciter confici, Sacerdotesque in altero ipsum Domini Corpus conficere debere, unumquemque scilicet juxta sue Ecclesie sive Occidentalis sive Orientalis consuetudinem. That the Body of Jesus Christ is really consecrated, or made into Wheaten Bread, either with or without Leaven, and that the Priests ought to make or consecrate the Body of our Lord with either of these, every one according to the Custom of his Church, whether Eastern or Western. Here is no mention of the conversion of the Substances, for the general Terms carri'd it away from the determinations of the *Latins*. Neither need Mr. *Arnaud* tell us as he does, that the *Greeks* took these words in a sence of *Transubstantiation*, because the *Latins* did so; For if the *Greeks* believed a true and real conversion of Substance, wherefore then was not that Article expressed in clear and proper Terms. The *Latins* were not ignorant of them, the *Greeks* knew them well enough, there being no word more common among them than that of *εἶσα*. That of *Substantia* had been already affected by the *Latins* in the Mystery of the *Eucharist*, and the Popes that preceded *Eugenus* the IV. were not wanting to bring it into that famous Confession of Faith which we have so often mention'd. In short Mr.

Lib. 4. cap. 2.  
Pag. 346.

Mr. *Arnaud* need not tell us so often of these *Equivocations*, for we know very well, that in these kind of *Accommodations*, wherein interest holds the chiefest rank, the two Parties agree commonly in certain generalities, which each of 'em endeavour to explain to their own advantage. There is nothing more common than these kind of Treaties, in which when there's foreseen any insuperable difficulties, they are usually left untoucht, both Parties contenting themselves with general Terms, by which each of 'em think to compass their designs. Mr. *Arnaud* is a Person of too much reading and experience to question a Truth so well known, and I believe we need not go far for instances of this kind. But, howsoever, this is certain and undeniable, that in all the Decrees of the Florentine Council, there appears nothing on the part of the *Greeks*, that establishes the conversion of Substances, but on the contrary, it seems as if they had prevail'd on the *Latins*, to abate their expressions in the solemn act of their re-union.

BUT before we leave this Proof, it is to be observed that *Bessarion* Archbishop of *Nice*, who was one of the Principal Agents in this *Accommodation*, in behalf of the *Greeks*, was a Person already brought over to the Interests of the *Latins*, and for his good Services was soon after made a Cardinal in the Roman Church. It cannot then but be supposed he favoured the *Latins*, and used all possible means to prevail on his own Country-men. In effect *Syropulus* complains of this; in such a manner, as sufficiently shews, what judgment we ought to make of this particular. In the mean time, compare I pray, the Terms *Bessarion* uses when he speaks in behalf of the *Greeks* in the Conferences of the Council, with those he uses in his Treatise of the *Eucharist*, wherein he speaks from his own head, since he was made a Cardinal, in *Specie*, say's he, in this Treatise, *Panis & Vini, veritas Corporis & Sanguinis continetur, cum in illa, Substantia Panis Vinique mutetur. The Body of Jesus Christ is really contain'd under the Species of Bread and Wine, the Substance being changed into this Body and Blood;* and a little farther, *verba dicuntur quibus dictis mox Consecratio fit, Transubstantialitas perficitur; The words are no sooner said but the Consecration is made, and the Transubstantiation finished.* 'Tis no longer ἀγιασμοῦ and τελειωμοῦ, Consecration and Sanctification, but Substantia mutatur, Transubstantialitas perficitur, the change of Substance, Transubstantiation. Whence comes this difference, but from that the *Greeks* do not use the same expressions as the *Latins*, and that there is not any Conformity between these two Churches in this Point of the Conversion of Substances? *Bessarion* counterfitting the Greek, makes use only of general expressions. But when he discovers himself to be a *Latin*, he speaks plainly and distinctly.

BUT besides *Bessarion*, this same difference is observable in other *Latinised Greeks*, engaged to propagate the Roman Doctrines, if we compare their Style with that of the true *Greeks*. Compare for example what Mr. *Arnaud* tells us out of *Emanuel Calecas*, and *John Plusiadene*, with what he himself allleges out of *Cicisilas*, *Mark of Ephesus*, *Simon of Thessalonica*, and others, and you will find these last mention not the change of Substance, whereas the former do expressly assert it. *Emanuel* tells us concerning the *Eucharist*, that God is able to change the inward Substance, and yet conserve the same Accidents entire. *Plusiadene* after the same manner, That the Substance of Bread is changed into the Body of Christ. Whereas there's no such expressions in the true *Greeks*: for we meet only with such expressions as these, that the Bread is really the Body of Jesus Christ, and that 'tis changed into the Body

*Body of Jesus Christ*: but as to the Substance they make no mention of it, and there is nothing but Mr. *Arnaud's* Consequence or Synonymy, which can make them do it.

## CHAP. IV.

*The Sixth Proof taken from the Greeks, employing on other Subjects, the same Expressions as on the Eucharist. Mr. Arnaud's Tenth Delusion manifested.*

THE only way to judge of the meaning of Authors, when 'tis matter of Debate, is to examine their Style in other like Matters, it being impossible, but in comparing their expressions some of 'em will give light to others. Had Mr *Arnaud* followed this method, he would never have valued so highly several expressions in Greek Authors; for he would have seen at the same time, that they deliver themselves almost after the same manner on other Subjects, where there's no Transubstantiation to be suspected. I know 'tis a hard matter for a Person that is prejudiced, to consider the question he handles, in those respects which are disagreeable to him; but besides that this prejudice is a fault, and therefore to be avoided, especially when men write on a Publick Account, or take upon them to instruct People; besides this, I say, there are several considerable matters which so offer themselves to be seen, that we cannot abstain from beholding them; and 'tis more especially in respect of these, that mens neglect is blame-worthy, because 'tis affected, and is inconsistent with the Rules of Sincerity. As for instance, how can we approve of Mr. *Arnaud's* proceeding, who has scarcely mentioned a word in his Book touching that prodigious ignorance which has overspread the East, in matters of Religion? How can we approve his taking no notice of that multitude of Emissaries, wherewith all that Country has been filled, for I know not how many Ages together, nor of the means used for the propagation of the Romish Doctrines, nor the progresses they made. These are things he could not be ignorant of, and are not matters of small importance; seeing the Judgment to be made of this whole Controversie, does in some measure depend thereon. But not to rehearse what we already mention'd, how can we bear with him, when he passes over in silence several Greek expressions, like unto those from which he would draw advantage, and yet are applied to Subjects which have not the least relation to Transubstantiation. These expressions offered themselves to him, and there needed little deliberation to determine what use was to be made of them, and what rank they hold in the decision of this Controversie. Yet has he taken no notice of them, for his desire of vanquishing has far exceeded his love to Truth.

BUT howsoever 'tis certain the *Greeks* speak almost after the same manner concerning the Church (it being likewise the Body of Christ) as they do concerning the *Eucharist*. *Cabasilas* is one of the Authors Mr. *Arnaud* has quoted with most complacency, having filled a long Chapter with Passages taken out of him, he alledges amongst others, these words of his 38 Chapter,



The Church is represented in the Mysteries of Religion, not as in the Signs, but as the Members are marked by the Heart, the Tree by the Root, and the Vine-branches by the Vine, forasmuch as the Mysteries are the Body and Blood of Christ, and that this Body and Blood are the Nourishment of the Church. So far is his Allegation; but 'tis requisite to hear Cabasilas himself in the full extent of his Discourse, to judge of the Style of this Author, and Mr. Arnaud's Delusion. The Church, say's he, is represented in the Mysteries of Religion, not as in the Signs, but as the Members are in the Heart; the Branches of the Tree in the Root, and the Vine-leaves in the Vine, as speaks our Lord. For here is not only a Communion of Names, or a reference of likeness, but 'tis the Identity of the thing it self; For the Mysteries are the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ. Now they are the real nourishment of the Church, and when she partaketh of them she does not change them into a humane Body, like unto other Food, but she her self is changed into them, *μεταβάλλεται εἰς ἐαυτήν*, forasmuch as the most excellent part has the predominancy. Behold the iron, when 'tis joyned with the fire, it becomes fire, and it does not make the fire become iron, for the fire effaces all the properties of the iron; so in like manner if any one could see the Church of Christ in that respect, whereby 'tis united to him, and partakes of his Flesh, he would behold nothing but the Body of Christ, and therefore St. Paul say's, you are the Body of Jesus Christ, and each of you are his Members; For when he calls him the Head and us the Members, he does not represent to us thereby the cares of his Providence, nor our subjection to him in the same sense as we call our selves the Members of our Parents, or Friends, by an hyperbolical way of speaking; But he means what he says; That the faithful by the efficacy of this Blood, live the Life which is in Jesus Christ, and have their real dependance on him as their Head, and are clothed with this Body.

It needs not now be demanded of Mr. Arnaud, why he cut short this passage of Cabasilas, seeing the reason manifestly appears; for if we take but the pains to compare what he alledges from this Author touching the Eucharist with what I now related touching the Church, we shall soon find that these last expressions are far stronger and significant than what he say's concerning the Sacrament. He excludes the bare communion of name and resemblance between Christ and the Church, and establishes a perfect Identity. He say's the Church is changed into the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ. He uses the comparison of iron inflamed, which others apply to the Eucharist, and as if he design'd to make us understand that the Church is Christ's Body in a literal and complete sense, he assures us this is no Hyperbole, and that St. Paul speaks the same thing. I am greatly deceived, if there can be any thing found so pressing and comprehensive in relation to the Eucharist, either in this Author, or any other of the true Greeks; and this shews on one hand, how vain and groundless Mr. Arnaud's Triumphs are, and on the other, how requisite and necessary a thing it is, for men to shew the Substantial Conversion, clearly, and expressly in the Doctrines of a Church before it be concluded she believes it.

CABASILAS is not the only man who speaks after this manner touching the Church, for others borrow his proper Terms to explain themselves fully like him; for we may find the same passage at large, in the first Answer of Feremias the Patriarch of Constantinople to the Divines of Wittemberg.

PHOTIUS spake likewise to the same purpose, and Occumenius after him, as appears by the Commentaries of the latter of these, on the Tenth Chapter

Chapter of the first Epistle to the Corinthians; *The Apostle*, say they, tells us, that the Bread is the Communion of the Body of Jesus Christ; but forasmuch as it seems that that which is communicated is of a different nature from him to whom 'tis communicated, he would now shew us that we do not communicate, but that we are all of us *αὐτὸ τὸ Σῶμα*, the same Body of Jesus Christ: For as one piece of Bread is made of several Grains, so we likewise altho several, are made one and the same Body with Jesus Christ: I believe there's few expressions to be found amongst the Greeks in the Subject of the Eucharist, which exceed these.

BUT besides what I now mentioned touching the Church, we must likewise consider the manner after which the Greeks do express themselves concerning the Book of the New Testament, or Volumn of the Gospels, when the Deacon who carries it in his hand lifted up enters into the Church. This entrance is called *μικρὴ εἰσοδος*, the small entrance, designing to represent by this Ceremony the coming of the Son of God into the World. They bow before this Book, and speak of it as if it were our Saviour himself, crying out altogether at the same time, *δεῦτε προσκυνώμεν καὶ προσπεσόμεν Χριστῷ, ὡς ὁ υἱοῦ θεοῦ*. Come let us worship Christ, and fall down before him, Save us O Son of God. As soon as they begin to read, the Bishop throws off his Mantle, and Simon of Thessalonica giving an account of this action, tells us, 'tis to give a publick testimony of his Servitude; For, say's he, when our Lord himself appears speaking in his Gospel, and is as it were present, the Bishop dares not cover himself with his Mantle. Isidorus de Pélusé used almost the same expressions before him, when the true Shepherd himself appears, say's he, in the reading of the Holy Gospel, the Bishop throws off his Mantle, to signify that the Lord himself the Prince of Pastors, our God and Master is present. I do not believe the Book is transubstantiated, and yet they speak and behave themselves, as if it was our Saviour himself; which already shews us that the Stile of the Greeks is always very mysterious, and that we have no reason to impute Substantial Conversions to them, every time they make use of excessive Terms.

We may likewise see here another Example of what I say, even in the very Bread of the Eucharist before its Consecration. The Greeks have two Tables, one which they call the *Prothesis*, and the other the great Altar. They place on the former of these, the Symbols, and express by divers mystical actions part of the Oeconomy of the Son of God, that is to say, his Birth, Life, and Sufferings. They solemnly carry them afterwards to the great Altar, where they consecrate 'em, so that before this 'tis but simple Bread and Wine, yet on which, they represent the principal passages of the life of Christ, and they say themselves that then the Bread and Wine are but a Type or Figure; Yet do they speak concerning them almost after the same manner before they are consecrated as after. *German* the Patriarch of Constantinople, calls them, the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, he say's, that the Saints and all the Just enter with him, and that the Cherubins, Angels, and all the Host of immaterial Spirits march before him, singing Hymns; and accompanying the great King our Saviour Christ, who comes to his Mystical Sacrifice, and is carried by mortal hands. Behold, say's he, the Angels that come with the Holy Gifts, that is to say, with the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, from Mount Calvary to the Sepulchre. And in another place, the Translation of Holy Things, to wit, of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, which come from the Prothesis, and are carry'd to the great Altar, with the Cherubick Hymn signifies the

*German in Theor.*

entrance of our Saviour Christ from Bethany into Jerusalem. He say's more-over, that our Saviour is carried in the Dish, and shews himself in the Bread, *Χρῖστος ἐν τῷ ἀρτῷ ὀρώμενον*. And as yet 'tis no more than Bread and Wine un-consecrated.

*Arcud. lib. de  
Euch. c. 20 &  
21.*

*ARCUDIUS* observes, some call this Bread the dead Body of *Jesus Christ*. He say's farther, that *Gabriel de Philadelphia*, calls it, the imperfect Body of Christ, and proves the Symbols are called in this respect, *ἀζυμα*, *ἁγια*, *ἁγία*, *καὶ ἀχαρακτήριστα μυστήρια*, the holy, divine, and unutterable Mysteries, which are the same names they give them after their Consecration.

*Arcud. lib. 3.  
de Euch.*

*Goar in Euch.  
notis in Miss.  
Chrys.*

WHEN they carry them from the *Prothesis* to the great Altar, the Quire loudly sing that which they call the Cherubick Hymn, in which are these words, *Let the King of Kings, and Lord of Lords, Jesus Christ our God draw near to be sacrific'd, and given to the Faithful for Food*. At which time their Devotion is so excessive, that *Arcudius* did not scruple to accuse the Greeks in this respect of Idolatry. *Goar* clears them of this crime, yet say's himself, that some bow, others kneel, and cast themselves prostrate on the ground, as being to receive the King of the World invisibly accompanied with his Holy Angels, that all of 'em say their Prayers, or recommend themselves to the Prayers of the Priests, and that they usually speak to our Saviour Christ, as if he was personally present, praying to him in the words of the good Thief, *Lord Remember me when thou comest into thy Kingdom*. The Priests answer, the Lord God be mindful of us all, now and for ever.

THEY repeat these words without ceasing, till he that carries the Symbols is ent'ed the Sanctuary, and then they cry out, *Blessed is he, that cometh in the name of the Lord*. And yet so far there's not any Consecration, and much less a Conversion of Substance.

*Goar ibid.*

WHILST the Symbols are still on the Table, they separate a Particle from the rest of the Bread in remembrance of our Saviour, and call the remainder the Body of the Virgin Mary. They afterwards lay another small piece on the right side of the first, in honour of the Holy Virgin, to the end they may say, in effect say's *Goar*, *παρὲν ἡ βασιλίσσα ἐκ δεξιῶν ᾧ ἐν ἱματισμῷ χρυσοῦ, περιελημμένῃ πεποικιλμένῃ*, The Queen is at thy right hand, in a Vestment of Gold wrought with divers colours. They set by another small piece in honour of St. *John Baptist*, another in honour of the Apostles, and several others for a remembrance of other Saints. *Goar* tells us, they separate nine pieces after this manner, besides those of our Saviour, and the Blessed Virgin his Mother, and that this is done to represent the whole Celestial Court. They afterwards carry all these to the great Altar, where the Consecration is performed; but when they speak of these Particles, they call one of 'em the Body of the Virgin Mary, th'other the Body of St. John, th'other the Body of St. Nicholas, and after the same manner all the rest. I know *Goar* denies they are thus called, affirming the Greeks say only *θεῖον μεῖδον*, the Particle of the Virgin, and not the Body of the Virgin, I know likewise that *Arcudius* seems not to be agreed in this Point, and perhaps the Latins have at length caus'd the Latinis'd Greeks to leave this way of speaking. But *Goar* himself say's, that some amongst the Latins have been so simple to imagine, that the Greeks believe the real Presence of the Body of the Blessed Virgin in her Particle of Bread; and what likelihood is there, Persons endued with the least sense, should fall into this Opinion, if the expressions



of the *Greeks* gave them not some reason for it? *Arcadius* assures us, that in his time, there was a certain Person in *Poland*, otherwise both Pious and Learned, who persuaded a Lady of *Russia* to receive no more the Sacrament from the hands of the Priests of her Religion, because they administered not the Body of *Jesus Christ*, but that of the *Virgin Mary*, and *St. Nicholas*, &c. This man's mistake, to whom *Arcadius* gives another kind of Character than that of a Calumniator, was no otherwise occasioned, but by the manner of speaking usual amongst the *Greeks*, who called these Particles the Body of this or th'other Saint. For 'tis not likely he invented this Fable himself, which is so impertinent and ridiculous. *Hottinger* affirms, there's to be seen in the Library of *Zurich* a Manuscript, which bears the name of one *Peter Numa-gen*, in which is expressly mention'd, that the *Greeks* affirm, the remainders of the Consecrated Bread, (which is to say, of that Bread from whence the great Particle has been taken in remembrance of our Saviour, and which they distribute to the People at the end of the Action, calling it *ἀσθιδωρον*,) to be the remainders of the Body of the *Virgin Mary*. *Guy Catinus* relates the same thing, the thirteenth Error of the *Greeks*, say's he, is, that they affirm the remainders of the Consecrated Bread, are the remains of the Body of the Blessed *Virgin*.

*Arcud. lib. 3.  
de Euch. c. 9.*

*Hist. Eccl.  
part. 4. p. 20.*

*Theoria rev.  
Eccles.*

*Sacred Nofe-  
gay. lib. 4. c. 3.*

*GERMAIN* the Patriarch of *Constantinople*, speaks after this manner, we need not doubt, say's he, but there are great spiritual blessings and advantages which do follow from the communication of this Bread, which is the Body of the Blessed *Virgin*. And the same kind of expressions are to be seen in *Boucher's* relation touching the *Greeks*: They all of 'em; hold, say's he, a most ridiculous and extravagant opinion; for they believe that under these Particles of the Consecrated Host, is really contain'd the Body of the *Virgin*, after the same manner as the Body of her Son under the principal parts of the said Host, so that they receive these Fragments with new Prayers and Preparatives in honour of the Mother of our Saviour. I do not doubt but that *Boucher* is mistaken as well as those mentioned by *Goar*, and this good man of *Poland* mention'd by *Arcadius*, in imputing to them such a ridiculous Superstition; but 'tis certain the occasion of this charge was the manner of the *Greeks* expressing themselves, who attribute to these Fragments and Particles of Bread, the name of the Body of the *Virgin* and Saints in the same manner as they call the great Particle our Saviour's Body.

NOW this manifestly shews we ought not to abuse (as Mr. *Arnaud* do's) their Mystical expressions; for seeing they apply them to the Bread, when as yet unconsecrated, and speak of it as if it was our Saviour himself, behaving themselves as if he was present in his Humane Nature; who then can find it strange if they express themselves above the ordinary rate, concerning the Consecrated Bread, which is the consummation of the whole Mystery? And seeing they are not sparing of their Mystical expressions touching the Particles of Bread: divided and set apart in honour of the *Virgin Mary* and Saints, what likelihood is there they should be more reserv'd in respect of that, which they consecrate in remembrance of the Son of God, and on which they express with so great Ceremony and Pomp, the whole Oeconomy of our Salvation? It is evident, that to attribute to them the belief of a real and substantial Conversion, according to the sense of the *Roman Church* they must have explain'd themselves in clear and proper Terms; for should we be guided by Mr. *Arnaud*, who makes the most trivial matters serve for Proofs, and draws Consequences from all Sides, either

right

right or wrong, we should run the hazard of being deceived, as well as those that imagined the Greeks believed the real presence of the Virgin Mary's Body, and that of St. Nicholas.

## CHAP. V.

*The Seventh Proof taken from that the Greeks do not believe the Particles of the Virgin Mary and the Saints ought to be consecrated on the great Altar, as is that of our Saviour, and yet they distribute them to the People in the same manner as they do the Body of Jesus Christ. Mr. Arnaud's Tenth Fallacy laid open. The Eighth Proof taken from their believing that the Eucharist consecrated on Holy Thursday, has a greater virtue than that which is consecrated at other times. The Ninth Proof taken out of several Passages of their Liturgies.*

WE have seen in the preceding Chapter, that the Greeks when as yet at the *Prothesis*, (that is to say, at the little Altar) do separate eleven Particles of Bread, the first and principal Particle in honour of our Saviour, the second in honour of his Holy Mother, and the rest in honour of the Saints, and that they carry all these and place them on the high Altar, where the Consecration is perform'd.

Arnaud. de  
Sac. Euch. lib.  
3. c. 10.

WE must here observe they believe not that all these Particles are consecrated, for they restrain this effect to that which bears the name of our Saviour, the others remaining unconsecrated. Arcudius affirms Simeon of Thessalonica (who lived in the beginning of the Fifteenth Century) to be the Author of this Opinion, against which he with much passion inveighs. Mr. Arnaud tells us we must not attribute this Error to all the Greeks; because, say's he, that Simeon protesteth before he proposed it, that he did not offer it dogmatically, but only as a probable Opinion; But Arcudius does not fully say this, he only tells us that Simeon, at the end of his whole Discourse adds, that he mentions not these things as Points of Doctrine, because he always follows the Sentiments of the Church. This is a Clause of Submission, but this is not to protest before the proposal of the Opinion, that he offers it but only as a mere Opinion. Mr. Arnaud adds, That 'tis likely the Greeks in the Council of Florence did answer the Latins according to the sense of Simeon, for the Acts mention that the Bishop of Mytilene fully satisfi'd them touching the Questions proposed, amongst which this was one. But he is mistaken, for the Question of the Latins was not concerning the Consecration of the small Particles, but touching the Making of these Particles, and uniting them with the great one, διατὶ διαλαμβάνομεν μετέδωκεν ἐν τῇ προζυμοῦσῃ καὶ ἐνδμεν τὰ θεῖα καὶ δεσποτικά ἅρτα. They demanded of us wherefore we divided the Particles in the Oblation, that is to say, on the *Prothesis*, and afterwards joyned them to the Divine Bread, or great Consecrated Particle. Now this Question does not respect the Consecration of these Particles, but supposes on the contrary they are not consecrated; for if the Greeks believed they were consecrated, it would be in vain for the Latins to demand wherefore they joyn them with that which is

is consecrated. It appears likewise by *Arcudius*, that *Gabriel* of *Philadelphia* maintains this Opinion of the non-Consecration of these Particles, not only as the bare Opinion of *Simeon* of *Thessalonica*, but as that of the whole Greek Church, for he recites these words of *Gabriel*, *What is it which persuades me of this? 'Tis first the Faith, and in the next place the Authority of the Holy Fathers, but in fine, I am persuaded of this, because 'tis the Doctrine which the Catholick Church dispersed over the Face of the whole Earth teacheth and confirmeth.* By this Catholick Church he means that of the Greeks. In like manner the Jesuit *Francis Richard* an Emiffary, speaking of this Belief touching the non-consecration of the Particles, tells us, *that he has had several Disputes with the Papa's that embraced this False Opinion, and that the People for want of Instruction know not what to believe.* Had Mr. *Arnaud* carefully perused *Leo Allatus*, his chief Author, who has furnished him with the greatest part of his Materials touching this Dispute about the Greeks, he might have found this Sentiment to be the same with that of the Monks of Mount *Athos*. *All the Monks, say's he, that inhabit Mount Athos, are of this Opinion, as testifies Athanasius Venoire, the Archbishop of Imbre, who dwelt a long time with them, and I my self have seen several who were Priests that zealously maintain'd the same thing.*

*Arcud. lib. 5. cap. 11.*

*Relation of the Isle of St. Erini.*

*Epist. 2. ad Nibuf.*

BUT be it as it will, Mr. *Arnaud* and I would draw from one and the same Principle very different Conclusions, the Principle is that the Greeks do not believe that the Particles are consecrated, his Conclusion is, that they then hold Transubstantiation, and mine on the contrary, that they then do not believe it. Let us now see which of these Conclusions is the truest.

HE tells us, that when any Object against the Greeks, that if their Opinion be true, it would follow, that they which communicated of these Particles would not receive the Body of *Fesus Christ*; they answer, there is put into the cup part of the Host truly consecrated, which is mixt with its Particles not consecrated, out of which afterwards they distribute in a spoon the Communion to the Laity, so that it commonly happens that all in general receive some part of the Body of *Fesus Christ*, and when it should fall out otherwise, it would only follow they communicated but of one kind.

*Lib. 4. cap. 1. pag. 330.*

BUT this pretended Answer of the Greeks hath no other Foundation than Mr. *Arnaud's* Authority, who alleges no Author to confirm it, and *Arcudius* who manages this Dispute against *Simeon* and *Gabriel*, and whence Mr. *Arnaud* has taken all he knows, makes no mention of it.

HE adds, *That this Error invincibly proves the Greeks hold Transubstantiation, and that we need but consider after what manner they express it.* And he afterwards produces the Passages of *Simeon* and *Gabriel*. *The Church upon just Grounds, say's Simeon, offers these Particles, to shew, that this lively Sacrifice, sanctifies both the quick and dead, but she makes them not Gods by nature. He means, that as the Saints are united to God by Grace, but become not Gods in their nature, so these Particles are united to the Body of Fesus Christ, altho they do not therefore become his Body. And this he clearly expresses in these words. The Saints being united to Fesus Christ, are deif'd by Grace, but become not Gods by nature; so likewise the Particles which are offered upon their account, obtain holiness by the participation of the Body and Blood, and become one with this Body and Blood by this mixture, but if you consider them separately, they are not the very Body and Blood of Christ, but are only joyned to them.* The Arch-  
bishop



bishop of Philadelphia say's the same thing in using the same comparison, as the Souls of the Saints, say's he, being brought to the light of the Divinity which enlightens them, become Gods only by participation, and not by nature, so these Particles, altho united to the Flesh and Blood of Jesus Christ, are not changed, but receive holiness by participation. After this Mr. Arnaud concludes in these words, it is as clear as the day, that all this has no sence, but only as it relates to the Doctrine of Transubstantiation, and that as these Authors suppose these Particles are not transubstantiated, so they suppose the greatest portion which is offered in the name of Jesus Christ, and from which alone is taken what is reserved for the sick, is effectually transubstantiated, and becomes the very Body of Jesus Christ.

BUT I shall not stick to tell him, his Philosophy deceives him, for these Authors do not dispute on this Point, that is to say whether these Particles are transubstantiated or not. But whether they are made the Body of Jesus Christ in the same manner as the great Portion. And this does in truth suppose that the great Portion becomes this Body, but not that it is transubstantiated. The comparison they use does not favour this pretended supposition, for they mean no more by it than this, that as the Saints are indeed united unto God, and partake of his holiness, but become not Gods by nature, so the Particles which represent the Saints, are really united with the great one which represents our Saviour Christ, and partake of its Sanctification, but they become not effectually what the great one is made, to wit, the Body of Jesus Christ. And this is their reasoning which does not satisfy us how the great Particle is made this Body, whether by a Substantial Conversion, or otherwise. And thus does Mr. Arnaud's Logick conclude nothing.

LET us see now the Conclusion I pretend to draw hence. First, we are agreed that in Simeon's sence these little Particles are bread in Substance, and represent the Saints. Now if we suppose the biggest ceases to be Bread, and is made the proper Substance of Jesus Christ, there can be nothing more impertinent than the Ceremony of the Greeks, to place in the same Mystery round about our Saviour, who is in his own proper Substance, not real Saints, but little morsels of Bread which represent them. Now methinks there is a great deal more reason in saying that the great Particle is the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ, and the small ones according to their way, mystical Saints, than to say that the great one is substantially Jesus Christ, and the small ones, are only Bread in Substance, and Saints in the Mystery.

Apud Ar-  
naud. lib. 3. cap.  
11.

MOREOVER, what means Simeon, when he tells us, that the small Particles become one with the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ by mixture? which is to say, that when they joyn them with the great Particle in the Cup, and mix them therein together, it is no more then but one and the same thing. For if we suppose, that as well the great one, as the lesser, are the Body of Jesus Christ, and mystical Saints, I find no difficulty therein, for he means that all these Particles put together make no more than one Mystery, which expresses that perfect Unity, which is between Christ and his Saints, which together with him make but one Body. But if on the contrary we suppose that the first Particle is Jesus Christ in Substance, there will be found nothing more absurd than the expression of this Person, when he tells us that little Saints made of Bread are converted into the very Substance of Jesus Christ. He is one and the same with his true Saints, whether they are in Heaven or on Earth,

Earth, but to say he becomes one and the same with their Figures and Representations, or with Crums of Bread, which represent them on an Altar, is in my opinion such an extravagant fancy, that we ought not to charge the *Greeks* with it.

IN fine *Arcadius* assures us, that 'tis customary to administer these Particles to the People, after the same manner as we do the Sacrament. He say's indeed that *Simeon* and *Gabriel* warned the Curats not to distribute them in this manner to the People, but to administer them with the great Particle mixt and pressed together in the Cup. Yet, adds he, *Simeon* ambiguously expresses himself, for he say's that the Particles are the Body of our Lord, when they are mixt with the Body and Blood, and are not so being separate, and therefore the Faithful may partake of them in the Sacrament, which is to say, they may receive them as the real Sacrament. Now tell me I beseech you, whether 'tis likely a man that believes the *Eucharist* to be the Body of Jesus Christ, in its proper Substance, would speak after this manner. These Particles, say's he, become the Body of our Lord when mixt, but separate they are not so. Is it that the conjunction and mixture transubstantiates them, and the separation untransubstantiates them? If this be his meaning, why does he so earnestly assert, that they are not consecrated? Why does *Gabriel* his Disciple, say, that they are not changed, altho united? He must certainly mean they are the Body of Christ, otherwise than in propriety of Substance, and he sufficiently explains himself, when he says in the second passage which Mr. *Arnaud* has alleged, *νομιζοντες μὲν τὸ ἑσχατὸν πρὸς αὐτῷ, they participate of the Body and Blood of our Lord*, which Mr. *Arnaud* understood not amiss when he translated it, *they receive holiness by the participation of the Body and Blood*. Which is to say, they are made the Body and Blood by a Communication of Sanctity, which comes to them from the great Particle by means of the mixture, even to the making them capable of being given in the Communion to the Faithful. Now there are several things which do hence necessarily follow. For first, it follows that the Bread which is the Body of Jesus Christ, not in Substance, but in Sanctification, is sufficient for the Communion of the Faithful. Secondly, that the great Particle is the Body of Jesus Christ in such a manner that it may be communicated to another piece of Bread without the change of its Substance, and by consequence that it is not it self this Body substantially, for besides that this manner of being the Body of Jesus Christ is incommunicable, it is evident that if it could be communicated to another Subject, even to the making of it the Body of Jesus Christ, it then follows that this other Subject must be transubstantiated. In a word, *Simeon's* meaning is, that the great Particle is in such a manner the Body of Jesus Christ, that it may communicate this honour to the rest, and make them become the Body of Jesus Christ in such a sort as renders them proper for the Communion. And to the same effect are these words of *Arcadius*. He saith, say's he, that the Particles are the Body of our Lord, when mixt with the Body and Blood, and therefore the Faithful may receive them in the Sacrament, and these other words, *νομιζοντες μὲν τὸ ἑσχατὸν πρὸς αὐτῷ, they communicate, or participate of the Body and Blood of our Lord*. It is then evident he means not that the great Particle is the Body of Christ in propriety of Substance, for this propriety cannot be communicated to another Subject, if we suppose at the same time as *Simeon* does, that this other Subject remains really Bread.

AND this is my Argument. Mr. *Arnaud* who saw the force of it, has  
T endeavour'd

endeavour'd to escape it by his usual Artifices, for on one hand he has concealed from us what *Arcudius* has expressly declared, to wit, that these Particles are the Body of Christ being mixt, and that the faithful may partake of them as of the Sacrament, and on the other, he has mis-represented *Simon's* sence, and pretended it to be to his advantage. But all his Artifices cannot hinder us from perceiving that the real Sentiment of the Greek Church is; 1. That the Substance of Bread remains in all the Particles, that is to say, as well in that which is consecrated as in all the rest. 2. That the consecrated Particle becomes the Body of Jesus Christ in full virtue of Sanctification, and is as it were a Fountain of Grace and Divine Efficacy. 3. That the other Particles by mixture and union with the great Particle do partake of this Sanctification, and become by this means the Body and Blood of our Lord, not after a complete and perfect manner like unto the great Particle, but in a far lower degree, which is yet sufficient to make them proper to be distributed to the People in the Communion, as being the Body and Blood of our Lord.

WE shall be confirm'd in this opinion, if we consider the eighth Proof which I shall here offer. It consists in that the *Greeks* believe the *Eucharist* consecrated on Holy Thursday, to have a greater efficacy than that which is consecrated at other times, which may be verifi'd if 'twere needful by the testimony of several Authors. See here what *Prærolus* say's, *They assure us*, say's he, *that this excellent mystery consecrated on the day in which our Saviour celebrated his Supper, that is to say, on Thursday in the Holy Week, hath a more*

*Prærol. Elem. Heres. lib. 7. pag. 101.* *excellent virtue, and is more efficacious than when 'tis consecrated on other days, and 'tis for this reason, according to Guy Le Carmes Relation, that they consecrate the Eucharist (for the sick) on no other day of the year than in that where in our Saviour made his last Supper, which they keep all the year only for this purpose. John de Lasko Archbishop of Gnesne, and Ambassadour from the King of Poland to Leo X. in the year 1514, relates the same thing of the Moscovites, whose Religion as every one knows, is in a manner the same with that of the Greeks. As to the Sacrament of the Eucharist, say's he, which they consecrate on the day in which our Lord made his last Supper, they say that this only is proper for the sick, and not that which is consecrated at other times, so that they consecrate Bread on that day for the whole year, in a Chalice prepared for that purpose, and put it dry and full of maggots (as it is) into the mouth of the sick with a spoon. Possévin the Jesuit in the writing he presented to the great Duke of Muscovia in the year 1582. In which he reckons up the Errours of the Greeks, especially remarks this as one of the chief; They err, say's he, in saying the most excellent Sacrament of the Eucharist, which is consecrated on the day in which our Lord made his last Supper, is more efficacious and of greater virtue than that which is consecrated on other days. Anthony Cancus Archbishop of Corcyra in his Relation of the Errors of the Greeks to Pope Gregory the XIII. observes likewise in the 14th. Article; That they hold the Sacrament of the Eucharist, which is consecrated on the day in which our Lord made his last Supper, has a greater virtue than that consecrated on other times. Allatius mentions this Article of Cancus, amongst others, which he censures as calumnies; but altho he is very earnest to refute this Archbishop, and treats him as unworthily as may be, without any respect to his Dignity, even to the calling of him, *os durum & Stygium, non nisi mentiri gnarum*, yet has not he dared to touch on this Article in particular, and his outrages only confirm in this regard the Authority of Cancus, and the truth of his Relation.*

*Prærol. Elem. Heres. lib. 7. pag. 101.*

*Raynald. ad ann. 1514.*

*Possévin. in Mosc pag. 43.*

*Allat. de perpet. cons. lib. 3. cap. 17.*



*ALPHONSUS* de Castro attributes this same opinion to the *Greeks*. Alphonsus de Castro. adv. ha- ref. lib. 6. tit. de Euchar. baref. He alledges for this effect, the Testimony of *Guy Carmus*; and altho he has been accustomed not to spare him in his censures whensoever he can find the least occasion, yet does he agree with him in this particular, saying, *we must not wonder if the Greeks be in this Error, seeing the Genius of that People lies, in expressing themselves after a vain manner, and in inventing of Fables.*

*ARCUDIUS* confirms the same thing, *There are, say's he, People so impertinent, as to believe, the Holy Eucharist which is prepared on that day (Holy Thursday) hath a greater virtue to sanctifie them who receive it, than that which is consecrated on another day. As if it were not still the same Jesus Christ, or as if our Lord was at sometimes more powerful than at others.* Arcud. lib. 3. cap. 55.

IF it be demanded what consequence we can hence draw against Transubstantiation; I answer it appears plain enough in it self. For if we suppose the *Greeks* hold the *Eucharist* to be made the Body of Jesus Christ; in virtue and efficacy, by means of this abundant sanctification which the Bread receives, we shall not find any absurdity in this other Opinion, which they hold, concerning the *Eucharist* consecrated on Holy Thursday, namely, that it is more efficacious than that consecrated on other days, for this sanctification of the Bread, and quickning Grace which accompanies it may have its degrees; it receives more and less, as the Schoolmen speak; but if you suppose the *Eucharist* to be made the Body of Jesus Christ by conversion of Substance, this more and this less, which they imagine, cannot be admitted; it is true indeed that the Sacrament will produce various effects, according to the various dispositions of the Persons who receive it, and according as there shall be more or less devotion in a man's Soul, it will feel more or less the strength of Grace, but the cause will be in them who shall receive the Sacrament, and not in the Sacrament it self, nor in the day of its Consecration. If the Bread becomes the proper Substance of the Son of God, it is always of equal virtue in it self; and the time of Consecration, can neither encrease nor diminish it. It is then scarcely to be imagined, that Persons who believe Transubstantiation, can fall into this other Opinion; for is it not the same Substance, the same Jesus Christ personally, is it not one and the same Conversion, which terminates it self in the same Subject? Whence then can proceed this *more* and *less*? Would they say that the Transubstantiation is made more on one day than another? This thought cannot happen in the mind of those that know what Transubstantiation means. Do they mean that the Body of Jesus Christ has greater virtue in it one day than another? This thought likewise cannot happen in the mind of those that know what our Saviour is. Do they hereby only mean that he displays a greater efficacy one day than another, altho he has ever the same measure of it in himself? It is certain that this more and this less of Grace, which the Faithful receive in the Communion (supposing we take the proper Substance of Jesus Christ with the mouths of our Bodies) cannot proceed from any other cause, but that of more or less devotion, which we bring with us to the Lord's Table. So that this Opinion of the *Greeks* being found inconsistent with that of Transubstantiation, and moreover it not appearing clearly to us that they have this latter, whereas it is plainly manifest they have the other, we are obliged to conclude they hold not the substantial Conversion. I know we must not imagine that men do always so exactly adjust their Sentiments, that they never contradict themselves; and I acknowledge

the *Greeks* are ignorant enough to have on the same Subject contradictory Opinions, but besides that there are certain palpable contradictions, of which few men how brutish soever they be are capable, as this would be to believe that the *Eucharist* is the proper Substance of the Son of God, and yet to be of a more excellent virtue being consecrated on Holy Thursday than on other days; besides this I say, seeing it does not expressly and clearly appear to us from any thing else that they believe Transubstantiation, it is far more just to give to their Terms, on the subject of the *Change* which happens to the Bread, a sense which agrees with this aforementioned belief, than to give them another which wholly contradicts it, and makes them ridiculous. If they must be led to the Substantial Conversion, or carried off from it by way of explication of their general expressions, there is more reason to expound them in a sense conformable to their other Opinions, than to make them guilty of manifest absurdities.

WOULD Mr. *Arnaud* lay aside for a while this Personal Interest wherewith he seems to be transported in this Dispute, and consider things without passion; I am persuaded he would soon acknowledge that the sense he imputes to the *Greeks* has no resemblance with the Terms of their Liturgies, nor other usual expressions. As for example, we would know how we must understand this Clause of their Liturgies, *Make this Bread the precious Body of thy Christ, and that which is in this Cup the precious Blood of thy Christ, changing them by the virtue of thy Holy Spirit.* Mr. *Arnaud* understands them as mentioning a change of Substance; I say on the contrary, these are general Terms, to which we cannot give at farthest any more than a general sense, and that if they must have a particular and determinate one, we must understand them in the sense of a Mystical change, and a change of Sanctification, which consists in that the Bread is to us in the stead of the Natural Body of Jesus Christ, that it makes deep impressions of him in our Souls, that it spiritually communicates him to us, and that 'tis accompanied with a quickning grace which sanctifies it, and makes it to be in some sense one and the same thing with the Body of Jesus Christ, and yet does not this hinder but that the Natural Substance of Bread remains. Let us examine the Liturgies themselves, to see which of these two senses are most agreeable thereunto.

*Euchar. Graecorum Jacobi Goar & Bibl. patr. Græcor. Lat. Tom. 2.*

WE shall find in that which goes under the name of St. *Chrysostom*, and which is the most in use amongst the *Greeks*, that immediately after the Priest has said, *Make this Bread to become the precious Body of thy Christ, and that which is in the Chalice the precious Blood of thy Christ, changing them by thy Holy Spirit*, he adds, *to the end they may purify the Souls of those that receive them*, that is to say, *be made a proper means to purify the Soul, by the remission of its sins and communication of the Holy Spirit, &c.* These words do sufficiently explain what kind of change we must understand by them, namely, a change of Sanctification and virtue, for did they mean a change of Substance, it should have been said, *changing them by thy Holy Spirit, to the end they may be made the proper Substance of this Body and Blood, or some such like expressions.*

*Biblis. Patr. Græco-Lat. Tom. 2.*

In the Liturgy, which goes under the name of St. *James*, we find almost the same thing; *Send, say's it, thy Holy Spirit upon us and these Holy Gifts lying here before thee, to the end that he coming may sanctify them by his holy, good and glorious presence; and make this Bread to become the Holy Body of thy Christ,*

Christ, and this Chalice the precious Blood of thy Christ, to the end it may have this effect to all them which shall receive it, namely, purifie their Souls from all manner of sin, and make them abound in good works, and obtain everlasting life. And this methinks does sufficiently determine, how the Bread is made the Body of Jesus Christ; to wit, in being sanctifi'd by the presence of his Spirit, and procuring the remission of our sins and our Sanctification.

The Liturgy which bears the name of St. Marc, has almost the same expressions, *Send on us and on these Loaves and Chalice thy Holy Spirit, that he* <sup>ibid.</sup> *may sanctifie and consecrate them, even as God Almighty; and make the Bread, the Body, and the Cup the Blood of the New Testament of our Lord God and Saviour Jesus Christ, our Sovereign King; to the end they may become to all those who shall participate of them, a means of obtaining Faith, Sobriety, Health, Temperance, a regeneration of Soul and Body, the participation of Felicity, Eternal Life, to the glory of thy great name.* A Person whose mind is not wholly prepossessed with prejudice, cannot but perceive that this Clause, *to the end they may become, &c.* is the explication of the foregoing words, *change them into the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ*, and that it determines them, *to a change*, not of Substance, but of Sanctification and Virtue. This Truth is so evident, that Arcudius has not scrupled to acknowledge, that if this Clause be taken (*make this Bread the Body of thy Christ*) in an absolute sence, <sup>Arcud. lib. 3. cap. 33.</sup> that is to say, that it be made the Body of Christ, not in respect of us, but simply in it self) it will have no agreement nor coherence with these other words that follow, *to the end they may be made, &c.* And he makes of this a Principle, for the concluding, that the Consecration is not performed by this Prayer, but that 'tis already perfected by the words, *this is my Body*, directly contrary to the Sentiment of the Greeks, who affirm 'tis made by the Prayer. So that if we apply Arcudius's Observation to the true Opinion of the Greek Church, to wit, that the Consecration is performed by this Prayer, we shall plainly perceive that their sence is, That the Bread is made the Body of Jesus Christ in respect of us, inasmuch as it sanctifies us and effects the remission of our sins.

AND with this agrees the Term of ἀγιαζεν to sanctifie, which the Greeks commonly make use of to express the Act of Consecration, and that of ἀγιασματα, the Sanctifications, by which they express their Mysteries, as appears by the Liturgies, and those of ἀγια δαρεα, ἀγιασμα δαρεα, ἀγια μυστηρια, μυστηρια (ωποια, ἀγιον αἶμα, the holy Gifts, the sanctified Gifts, the holy Mysteries, the quickning Mysteries, the holy Bread, which are common expressions amongst them. All which favours the change of Sanctification.

ON the other hand we shall find in the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom, that the name of Bread is given three times to the Sacrament after Consecration, in the Pontificia four times, and in the declaration of the pre-sanctifi'd Bread, it is so called seven times. In the Liturgy of St. Basil the Priest makes this Prayer immediately after the Consecration, *Lord, remember me* <sup>Archi. Habers</sup> *a sinner, and as to us who participate all of us of the same Bread, and Cup, grant* <sup>Apud. Goar.</sup> *we may live in Union, and in the Communion of the same Holy Spirit.* Like- <sup>in Euchol.</sup> wise what the Latins call Ciborium, the Greeks call εὐχαριστου, which is as much as to say, a Bread Saver, and 'tis in it wherein they put that which they call the pre-sanctifi'd Bread, being the Communion for the sick. I know what is wont to be said in reference to this, namely, that the Eucharist is called Bread upon the account of its Species, that is to say, of its Accidents, which



which remain sustain'd by the Almighty Power of God without a Subject; but the *Greeks* themselves should give us this explication; for till then we may presume upon the favour of the natural signification of the Term, which we not finding attended with the Gloss of the *Latins*, it must therefore be granted not to favour the Conversion of the Substances.

IT is no more favour'd by several other Clauses in the same Liturgy. For in that of St. *Fames* there is a Prayer, which the Priest directs to our Saviour in Heaven; altho he has the Consecrated Bread before him, Ἄγιε, say's he, ὁ ἐν ἁγίοις ἀναπαύομεν, κερὶ ἁγίασον ἡμᾶς τὰ λόγῳ τῷ σὺς χαεῖτο, καὶ τῇ ἐπιφορτῇ τῷ παναγῆς ἁγίου πνεύματι. O thou Holy One, that dwellest in the Holy Places, sanctifie us by the Word of thy Grace, and coming of thy Holy Spirit. We find this same Prayer in St. *Mark's* Liturgy. In those of St. *Basile*, and *Chrysostom*, there is another directed after the same manner to our Saviour in Heaven. Look down we beseech thee, say's it, O Lord *Fesus Christ* our God, from the Holy Place of thy Habitation, and Throne of thy Glory, which is in thy Kingdom, and come to sanctifie us, thou that sittest at the right hand of the Father, and art here with us invisibly. Mr. *Arnaud* perverts these last words, and who art here invisibly with us, not considering they relate to that part of the Petition, wherein, they beseech him, to come and sanctifie them, and that they only signifie this invisible presence of his Grace and Divinity, which he promised his Disciples when he left the World, and ascended up into Heaven. It plainly appears that the intention of the Greek Church is to send up their Devotions to the Place where our Saviour inhabits. How comes it to pass, we find not at least one Prayer wherein is expressed, that he has clothed the proper Substance of his Humanity, with the Veil of the Accidents, or some such like words? But on the contrary, when the Priest reads with a loud voice, τὰ ἅγια τοῖς ἁγίοις, Holy Things are for Holy Persons, the Quire answers, there is only one that is Holy, only one Lord, who is *Fesus Christ*, at the Glory of God the Father. For 'tis clear, that these words, at the Glory of God the Father, mean that he is above in Heaven. In the Liturgy of the pre-sanctifi'd (Bread,) the Priest thus addresses himself to God, beseeching him, that his only Son may rest on this Altar, by vertue of these dreadful Mysteries thereon expos'd; thus manifestly distinguishing the Mysteries from *Jesus Christ*, and immediately prays, That he would sanctifie our Souls and Bodies, by a perpetual Sanctification, to the end that partaking of these Holy Things with a pure Conscience, a holy assurance, and enlightned mind, and being quickned by them, we may be united to *Fesus Christ* himself, our true God, who has said, he that eateth my Flesh and drinks my Blood, dwells in me, and I in him. By which words it is evident, that the Mysteries are plainly distinguished from our Saviour himself, and that those who receive them unworthily, are not united with him. In the Liturgy of St. *Basil* the Priest prays, That receiving with the Testimony of a pure Conscience the Particle of the Sanctifications of God, we may be united to the Body and Blood of his Christ, and that receiving these things worthily, we may have *Fesus Christ* dwelling in our hearts. These words do moreover distinguish *Jesus Christ* from the Sacrament he has ordained, and 'tis certain these Terms, of *Fesus Christ* dwelling in our hearts, do more plainly intimate a Spiritual Communion, than a corporeal one. In fine in this same Liturgy the Priest having performed his Office in this particular, makes a Prayer unto God, in which he recapitulates whatsoever has passed in this Mystical Celebration; but mentions not the least tittle concerning Transubstantiation. We have, say's he, finished and consummated the Mystery of thy Oeconomy, O *Fesus Christ* our God, as far as we have been able. For we have celebrated the memory of

Bibl. Patr.  
Græc. Lat.  
Tom. 2.

Eurbo. Guar.

Ubi supra.

of thy Death, we have beheld the Figure of thy Resurrection; we have been filled with thy never fading Life, and been made partakers of thy immortal Pleasures, grant we may be found worthy to enjoy the same in the World to come. Is it not a wonderful thing there should not in all this be the least mention of the conversion of the Substances, which is yet in the sence of the Roman Church the most essential part of that Mystery, that whereunto all the rest does tend, and whereon depends so much, that the rest without this would signifie nothing. Let Mr. Arnaud alledge what he pleases, 'tis not to be imagin'd the Greek Church would forget this part of the Mystery in such a solemn recapitulation which it makes to God at the end of its Office, did she in effect believe any other Change in the Bread, than that of its Virtue and Holyness.

## CHAP. VI.

The Tenth Proof taken from that the Greeks do often use an extenuating Term, when they call the Eucharist the Body of Jesus Christ. The Eleventh from their not believing the wicked who partake of the Eucharist, do receive the Body of Jesus Christ. The Twelfth from their believing the dead, and those in Deserts remote from all Commerce, do receive the same as we do in the Communion.

**A**LTHO the Greeks do frequently call the Eucharist the Body of Jesus Christ, yet must we not thereupon immediately conclude that they are in this respect of the same opinion with the Church of Rome; and adopted Transubstantiation or the substantial presence amongst the Articles of their Faith. One Proof of the contrary of this, is, that sometimes, when they mention the consecrated Bread, and give it the name of the Body of Jesus Christ, they add a Term of Diminution, which shews they do not mean that it is his Body in propriety of Substance. Which appears by a passage taken out of Balsamon on the Seventieth Canon of the Apostles. This Canon ordains a punishment to those that shall fast with the Jews, and celebrate their Feasts; and Balsamon takes hence an occasion to inveigh against the Feasts of unleavened Bread, in these words. *If a man deserves to be deposed only for eating unleavened Bread with the Jews; and expelled the Christian Communion; what punishment do they not then deserve that partake of it, as of the Body of our Lord, and celebrate the Passover after the same manner as they do?*

MATTHEW Blastarius, speaks almost to the same purpose, in Arcudius. They, say's he, that celebrate the mystical Sacrifice with unleavened Bread, do greatly offend against the Christian Customs; for if they who only eat the unleaven'd Bread of the Feast of the Jews, ought to be deposed and excommunicated, what excuse can they make for themselves, who receive it as if it were the Body of our Lord.

SIMEON of Thessalonica expounding that passage of the Liturgy, where the Priest perfumes the Gifts, in saying these words, *Be thou exalted, O God,*  
above

Guar in Eu-  
col. p. 153.

Apud. Alst.  
de perp. conf.  
lib. 3. cap. 13.

above the Heavens, and be thou glorifi'd thro' out all the Earth; the Priest, say's he, speaks of the Ascension of our Lord, and the Glory here-received when he was preached to every Creature; as if, he spoke to our Saviour himself, and said to him, Thou art descended to us, thou hast ascended into Heaven, and fillest the whole Earth with thy Glory. And therefore do we celebrate these Holy Mysteries, and partake of and possess thee eternally. Wherefore have we this (as if) he spoke to him, *οἱ οὖν διαλεχόμενοι τὰς σωτηρίας*, which Guar has well translated, *Quasi cum salvatore differeret*. How comes it to pass, I say, we have this, quasi, if in effect our Saviour was present, and the Priest spake to him? It may be alledged the passages I come from producing have some ambiguity, for it may be doubted whether by the aforementioned *Ἀζυμᾶ*, is meant, as being the Body of our Lord, or as if it were the Body of our Lord, that is to say, as if it were in the stead of our Lord's Body. But first of all this ambiguity is void in respect of the passage of Simeon, who tells us, that the Priest does, as it were speak to our Saviour; for it cannot be alledged, that this is either a quasi of quality or of Identity, if I may so speak, nor give it another sence than this, to wit, that the Priest speaks no otherwise, than if he had our Saviour himself in Person before him, and directed his Discourse to him, in the same sence, as he says, *Let us see our Saviour speaking in the Gospel*, and that he is, as it were, present, *ὡς παρὸν ἔστι*, and elsewhere, *That the Priest holding the Gospel in his hand, gives it to be kissed by him that takes upon him the Christian Profession, as if it were our Saviour himself, ὡς ἴ σὼτῆρα, and says to him, behold Jesus Christ is invisibly present in the midst of us.* Now this contributes to the resolving of whatsoever may seem doubtful in the other passages.

MORE OVER the reasoning of Balsamon and Blastarius clears the difficulty: for if we suppose they believed Transubstantiation, we cannot give any tollerable sence to their Discourses. In effect, either they acknowledged that the Azyme was changed into the Body of Jesus Christ, as well as the leavened Bread, or deni'd it; if they acknowledged it, their sence is, that 'tis a great crime to eat the proper Body of Jesus Christ, under the Accidents of an Azyme. Now this is absurd: for if the Body of Christ be really under the Accidents of the Azyme, what crime is there in thus eating of it? For that which is eaten is no longer a real Azyme, but the Substance of the Body it self. Wherefore moreover should they be judged more worthy of condemnation than those who mix themselves with the *Fews* when they celebrate their Feast, and eat unleavened Bread with them? For the latter of these do really eat an Azyme, whereas the others receive only the Accidents of it, which serve as a vayl to the proper flesh of our Lord. If it be said they do not acknowledge the Azyme to be changed into the Body of Jesus Christ, as the leavened Bread is, their sence will be that 'tis a greater Crime to eat an Azyme, in supposing it to be the Body of Jesus Christ, than to eat the same Azyme, wittingly and willingly, in the Communion of the *Fews*. Now this is no less absurd, for the intention, and belief, which the first have, lessens their fault, whereas the knowledge and intention of the other aggravates it. They that eat the Azyme with the *Fews*, mean only to eat an Azyme; whereas those that eat it in imagining they eat the Body of our Lord, pretend nothing less than to eat an Azyme; so that it cannot be said in this respect, but that the crime of these last is greater than that of the others. It must then be granted that to give a likely sence to Balsamon and Blastarius, their quasi must be a quasi of comparison and not of Identity, and that they mean, that for a man to eat unleavened Bread in stead of the Body of



of Jesus Christ, is a greater crime than to eat it simply with the *Jews*, because this is an introducing of Judaism in the Christian Religion, and to make of that which is accursed, the Mystery of our Lord's Body. Mr. *Arnaud* will without doubt reply, that they dispute against the *Latins*, and so by consequence this *quasi* ought to be taken in the sense of the *Latins*. Now the *Greeks* know very well that the *Latins* do not receive the Bread of the *Eucharist* instead of the Body of Jesus Christ, but as being really and in effect this Body it self. I answer that *Balsamon* and *Blastarius* do not dispute in particular against the *Latins*, whom they do not so much as mention in the Commentary they wrote on the Seventieth Canon of the Apostles; but establish in general this Rule, that we ought not to eat unleavened Bread in this Mystery. So that this subterfuge will not serve Mr. *Arnaud's* turn, for their *quasi* must be taken in the sense of the *Greeks*, and not in the sense of the *Latins*. But supposing there be still a great deal of ambiguity in this Term; yet is it fully cleared by the expression of *Joh. Citrius* in a passage cited by *Allatius*; We offer, say's he, *leaven'd Bread in the Sacrifice instead of the Body of our Lord*. And this is the meaning of this *ὡς*, of the *Greeks*, as the Body, that is to say, *instead of the Body*. *Arnaud Allat. lib. 3. c. p. 12. Conf. cap. 12.*

IT is in the same sense that *Germain* the Patriarch of *Constantinople*, say's, That as often as we eat this Bread, and drink of this Cup, we confess the Death and Resurrection of Jesus Christ, and that in this Belief we eat the Bread, and drink of the Cup, AS of the Flesh of the Son of God, confessing his Death and Resurrection. We find the same Particle used by *Nicetas Choniatus*; Our Saviour, say's he, is AS it were eaten after his Resurrection.

ST. *Athanasius* used this Particle, AS a great while before him. Our Saviour, say's he, after his Passion and Resurrection sent his Apostles, to gather together the Nations, having spread his Table, which is the Holy Altar from which he gives the heavenly and incorruptible Bread, to wit, his Body, and Wine that makes glad the heart of man, *ὡς ὅτι καὶ τὸ καὶ τὸ αἶμα, mingling, AS it were his Blood in the Chalice*. These *quasi's* have such a bad relish with them, that Father *Noüet*, alledging this passage of St. *Athanasius*, has thought good to leave it out, and 'tis the same antipathy to *quasi's* that obliged the Translators of *Mons* to leave out one, which they found on another Subject in the Text of St. Paul in his Third Chapter of the First Epistle to the *Corinthians* Verse 15. For whereas the Greek reads, *αὐτὸς ὁ σωθήσεται, ὅπως ὁ ὡς διὰ τοῦ πυρός*, *ipse autem salvus erit; sic tamen quasi per ignem*, which they have translated, *he shall be saved, but must pass thro the fire*. The respect due to St. Paul could not save his *quasi* from the fury of these Gentlemen. And thus do they deal with the Holy Scripture, when it speaks not according to their mind. *Athan. disp. hab. in Concil. Nic. V. l. alius sub nomine Athanasii.*

I know not whether the *quasi's* of *Balsamon*, *Blastarius*, *Simeon* of *Thessalonica*, *Germane*, *Nicetas*, and those of *Athanasius* are less distastful to 'em, than that of St. Paul: But howsoever these diminutive Terms do sufficiently evidence the *Greeks* do not believe Transubstantiation, for the se that do believe it study rather to strengthen by clear and precise expressions the name of the Body of Jesus Christ, which is given to the *Eucharist*, than to weaken it by restrictions and diminutions.

BUT to go on with our Proofs, It is an opinion generally received amongst the *Greeks*, That the wicked who participate of the *Eucharist*, do not receive

receive the Body of Jesus Christ. And that they do hold this opinion may be proved by the Testimony of several good Authors.

*Prateol. Elen. Heretic. lib. 7. cap. de Gracii.* **P R A T E O L U S** expressly mentions this amongst their Errors. *They affirm*, say's he, *that those who live in the practice of any known sin do not receive the Body of Jesus Christ, altho they draw near to the Table of our Lord, and receive the consecrated Bread from the hands of the Priest.*

*Possevin 'in Mosc. p. 43.* **P O S S E V I N** the Jesuit confirms the same thing. *They err*, says he, *in affirming those that are defiled with sin do not receive the Lord's Body when they come to the Altar.*

*Gabist. in explicat. Litur. cap. 22.* **N I C H O L A S** Cabasilas does fully set forth the Belief of the Greek Church touching this Point. *The causes*, say's he, *of our sanctification, or if you will the dispositions which our Saviour requires of us, are purity of Soul, and love of God, an earnest desire to partake of the Sacrament, and such a thirst after it as shall make us run to it. These are the things which procure our Sanctification, and with which it is impossible but those that come to the Communion must partake of Jesus Christ, and without which it is impossible they should. And a little further endeavouring to prove that the Souls separate from their Bodies, do receive the same as the Faithful which are living in this World of the Sacrament. If the Soul*, say's he, *has no need of the Body whereby to receive Sanctification, but on the contrary the Body has need of the Soul, what more of the Mystery do the Souls receive which are clothed with their Bodies, than those which are stript of them? Is it that they behold the Priest and receive the Gifts from him? But the Souls that are out of the Body have the Eternal Priest, who is to them more than all these things, being the same likewise that administred it to them alive, who receive it as they ought to do. For all those to whom the Priest administers it, cannot be said truly to receive it. The Priest administers it to all that come to him, but our Saviour gives it only to those that are worthy to partake of it: Whence it clearly appears that 'tis our Saviour alone, who by means of this Sacrament consecrates and sanctifies the Souls as well of the living as the dead.*

*Apud Allat. de Simeon Nil. in Patr. Bibl. Patr. Græco-lat. Tom. 2.* **L E O** Allatius has made a Catalogue of Simeon the Abbot of St. Mamant's Works, who lived about the end of the Eleventh Century, and whom the Greeks call Simeon the Divine. Now in one of his Treatises there is a Hymn expressly relating to this Subject before us, to wit, that the wicked do not partake of the Body of Jesus Christ when they receive the Sacrament. *Allatius* tells us that he has seen this particular piece, (being a Manuscript) in a certain Library in Italy, and that the Title of it is, *That they which receive unworthily the Sacraments do not receive the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ.* And 'tis unto this whereunto relates what Nilus say's in his Sentences, *Keep your selves from all corruption, and partake every day of the Mystical Supper, for 'tis after this sort, that the Body of Jesus Christ becomes ours. And what we find in the Verse of Psellus on the Canticle of Canticles, Jesus Christ gives his Body to the Children of the Virgin, that is to say, to the Church, for thus does he speak to them, (but 'tis Only to those that are worthy) whom he calls his near Kindred, come my Friends eat and drink, and be merry my brethren, you that are my brethren in good Works, eat my Body and drink my Blood. And these words of Foanicius Cartanus, the Saints are made partakers of holy things, not they that are unworthy, and sinners who having not cleansed themselves from their sins remain still polluted, and elsewhere, when we shall draw near unto God with Love, Fear, Reverence and Repentance, and be in charity with all men, then shall*

*Comm. trium. Patr. in Cant. Cant.*

*Apud Allat. de perpet. Cons. lib. 3.*

*shall we be meet partakers of the Body and Blood of Christ.*

NOW if you would know of what importance the Argument is, which we draw from this Doctrine of the *Greeks*, you need but read what *Chifflet* the Jesuit and others have written touching a passage of the Confession attributed to *Alcuinus* which bears, *That the virtue of this Sacrifice is so great, that it is the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ only to the just sinners, tanta est virtus hujus Sacrificii ut solis justis peccatoribus Corpus sit & Sanguis Christi.* *Chifflet. praefat. ad Lector. in Confess. Alcu.* If the Sacrifice, or Sacrament, say's this Jesuit, be the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ to some only, and not to all, what remains then but to confess, that *Alcuinus* has been the Forerunner of *Berengarius* and *Calvin*: and that he has denied the Real Presence of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist? He tells us this passage has given him no small trouble, and endeavours to expound it, saying, that *Alcuinus* speaks of the Body and Blood of Christ in respect of their salutiferous effect which appertains only to the Just. But the Authors of the Office of the B. Sacrament; having told us, that it seems we must read, *tanta est virtus Sacrificii ut solis justis, non peccatoribus Sanguis sit & Corpus Christi*, they have added, *that this expression has not been used since the Heresie of Berengarius, and that the Schoolmen who have been more scrupulous as to Terms, have (after the rise of the Heresies touching this Mystery) avoided it.* Which is as much as to say, in my opinion, that if we believe Transubstantiation, as the Church of *Rome* has believed it since the time of *Berengarius's* condemnation, we cannot be of this Belief, that the Eucharist is only the Body of Jesus Christ to the faithful and not to the wicked. And in effect if the Substance of Bread be really changed into that of Christ's Body, it hence evidently follows that all those that communicate thereof (be they either righteous or wicked) do receive this Body as it is, that is to say, in its proper Substance, covered with the vail of Accidents. So that the *Greeks* asserting the Eucharist not to be the Body of Christ to Sinners; (as I have already shew'd) makes the Proof I draw hence concerning their not believing of Transubstantiation to be solid and convincing.

In their Historical and Chronological Table under the title of B. Alcuin.

YET may there be two Objections made against my Argument; the First, That what the *Greeks* say concerning Christ's Body, is to be understood only in respect of its salutiferous effect, as has been declared by the Jesuit *Chifflet*, and not in respect of its Substance, which is to say, their meaning is, that the wicked do indeed receive the real Substance of this Body and Blood, but receive thereby no advantage: The Second, that the Bread reassumes its former Substance, when a wicked man approaches to receive the Communion, and that that of the Body of Jesus Christ withdraws it self. But first, I say to make people of good sense contented with this explication, they must be shewed these kind of meanings in the Writings of the *Greeks* themselves, which without question would be met withall, did they hold Transubstantiation. It cannot be denied but this Doctrine they teach concerning the wicked does manifestly oppose that of the Substantial conversion, and furnisheth us with this conception, that if the Eucharist be not the Body of Jesus Christ to the wicked, how can it then be said, that the Substance of the Bread has been changed into that of this Body? This scruple does naturally arise in the mind of those that believe Transubstantiation, as appears by the example of the Jesuit *Chifflet*, by that of the Authors of the Office of the blessed Sacrament, and by the pre-caution of the Schoolmen and Latin Writers who carefully shun these kind of expressions. We need not doubt but if the *Greeks* believed the conversion of the Substances they



*Possevin ubi  
Supra.*

they would do one of these two things, either they would renounce this other Opinion, and deliver themselves after another manner, or at least they would so expound and mollifie it as to shelter thereby Transubstantiation. But besides this, I say, if we examine these pretended illustrations in particular one after another, we shall find they are vain and ill apply'd to the *Greeks*. In effect the first cannot be of any use, because the *Latins* impute to them the Doctrine here in question, as an Error. Now this would not be an Error in respect of the *Latins*, if the *Greeks* understood it only in this sense, that the wicked do not receive the salutiferous effect of the Body of Jesus Christ in the Communion, altho they received the Substance of it, for even this is believed in the Church of *Rome*. Yet *Possevin* does not only affirm they err, but he opposes moreover against their Error a contrary Proposition to be held, and on which he grounds his censure. *They err*, say's he, *for the wicked do really receive the Body of Jesus Christ, although they receive it unworthily, and to their condemnation.*

*Cabasilas ubi  
Supra.*

AS to the other Objection, 'tis certainly groundless, for not to take notice of the extravagancy of this Opinion, that the Substance of the Bread is changed into that of Christ's Body, and again that of the Body into that of the Bread, the Terms of *Cabasilas* are so clear that they admit not any evasion, for he distinguishes two Persons that give the Communion, one the Priest, and th'other our Saviour Christ, and he attributes to our Saviour alone the glory of giving his Body and Blood, 'tis likewise he himself, say's he, *that administers to them amongst the living who truly receive. For all them to whom the Priest gives it, do not truly receive it.* He himself; that is to say, immediately and without the Priests sharing in the honour thereof. The Priest has the honour to distribute the Bread, but not of giving the Body and Blood. Now this does wholly overthrow Transubstantiation, and refutes the second Objection which I examine, for if the Bread were transubstantiated, there would be no need of having recourse to our Saviour himself, in order to his giving the Faithful his Body and Blood, the Priest would give it them, for that which he holds in his hands and communicates to the Faithful, would be this Body and Blood in propriety of Substance, and *Cabasilas* would have no reason to oppose our Saviour to the Priest.

*Cap. 42.*

BUT before we leave this passage of *Cabasilas*, it is necessary to observe two things, one of which respects the Proposition he would establish, and th'other the means he makes use of for this. The Proposition he would establish is, That the dead receive the same as the living when they partake of the Eucharist. *The purity of the Soul*, say's he, *the Love of God, Faith, an earnest desire to partake of this Holy Mystery, a secret joy which accompanies this desire, a fervent appetite and thirst which makes us run to it, these are the things which procure our Sanctification, with which qualifications it is not possible but those that approach the Communion do partake of Jesus Christ, and without which it is impossible they should.* Now all these things depend only on the Soul, and are not corporeal. There is nothing then which hinders the Souls of the dead from having these things as well as the living. If then these Souls are in the state and disposition requisite for the receiving of the Mystery, if he to whom it belongs to bestow Sanctification and Consecration is always willing to sanctifie, and ever desires to communicate himself in all places, what can then hinder this participation? And a little further, *It is evident*, say's he, *by the things I now mention'd, that whatsoever belongs to this Mystery is common as well to the dead as living, and a little lower, the participation of the Holy Gifts is a thing which necessarily attends*

*Cap. 43.*

tends the Souls after death. If their joy and repose sprang from any other Principle; it might be said that even this would be the reward of that purity wherein they are, and this Table would be no longer needful to them. But it is certain that whatsoever makes up their delights and felicity, whether you call it Paradise, or Abraham's bosom, or those happy seats free from sorrow and cares, or that you call it the Kingdom of Heaven it self, all this I say is no more than this Bread and Wine. For these things are our Mediatour, who is entred as our Fore-runner into the Holy Places, who alone conducts us to the Father, who is the only Sun of our Souls, which at this time appeareth and communicates himself to all them that are in the Bands of the Flesh in the manner he himself pleases, but he shall then visibly manifest himself without a Vail, when we shall see him as he is, and shall gather together the Eagles about the dead Body. He afterwards proves that the Souls separte from the Bodies, are far more fit to partake of the Mysteries, than when cloathed with their Flesh, that whatsoever rest or recompence they enjoy, is nothing else but this Bread and this Cup, of which the dead have as much right to participate as the living, and for this reason, our Saviour calls the Saints felicity a *Supper*, to shew us thereby, that 'tis nothing else but this Table. And this already gives us great cause to suspect that *Cabasilas* did not believe that which we eat in the Sacrament to be the proper Substance of the Body and Bloud of Christ; for we must not imagine he thought the Souls of the dead did really partake thereof. They do indeed participate of the Body and Blood of Christ, but after a spiritual manner, which is accomplished without our Saviour's Substance entring into them. Yet *Cabasilas* say's the dead receive the *Holy Gifts*, that they receive the Mystery, and that which makes up their felicity, is this Bread and Cup, that they partake of it, and that whatsoever appertains to this Mystery is common to them with the Living. All which is well enough understood provided it be supposed we have no other Communion with our Saviour Christ in the *Eucharist* than what is Spiritual, for the Souls separte from the Body have this as well as we, and partake of our Bread and Cup, not in respect of their Substance and Matter, but in respect of the Mystery they contain and Grace they communicate, and thus it is certain that whatsoever belongs to this Mystery is common to them with the living. But if we supposed the Substantial Conversion, how could it be said, *They partake of the Holy Gifts, that they receive what we receive, that we have nothing more in the Mystery than they, and that whatsoever appertains to the Mystery is common to them with us?* For in fine we should really receive the proper Substance of the Body and Blood of Christ which they do not.

**BUT** to manifest more clearly this Doctrine of *Cabasilas* and put it out of doubt, we should consider the course he takes for the strengthening of his Proposition. For it will appear that this participation of the Body and Blood of Christ, which he makes common both to the dead and living, respects not only the thing of which we partake, but likewise the manner of partaking of it; and in a word, he means we communicate thereof no otherwise than Spiritually. First, then he always speaks of the Sanctification which is made by way of participation and reception of the Body of Jesus Christ, as of one and the same thing, without the least difference, which is justifi'd by the bare reading of his whole Discourse. Now this shews us, he means not that we receive in the Sacrament the proper Substance of the Body of our Lord, for if it were so, the wicked would receive it without receiving Sanctification, as the Church of *Rome* it self does acknowledge, and the reception of this Substance, and the Sanctification, could not be considered but as two distinct things.

Cap. 42:

things. Yet *Cabasilas* confounds them, and thereupon immediately considers this difficulty; how the dead which neither eat nor drink can be sanctifi'd by this participation. *Are they*, say's he, *in a worse condition in this respect than the living?* No sure, say's he, for our Saviour communicates himself to them in such a manner as is best known to himself. He afterwards inquires into the causes of the sanctification of the living, and their participation of Jesus Christ, and say's, 'tis not to have a Body, nor to come with feet to the Holy Table, nor to receive the Communion with our hand and mouth, nor to eat or drink, but that 'tis the purity of the Soul, Faith, Love of God, and other motives of Piety, these are the things, say's he, which make us necessarily partakers of Jesus Christ, and without which it is not possible to be so. Whence he concludes that the Souls seperate from the Body are capable of this participation, and that in effect they have it seeing they have all these good affections. Now it hence plainly appears that he grants the living but one kind of participation of Jesus Christ which is Spiritual; and which they have in common with the dead, and which immediately respects the Soul. For if they be only the good dispositions of the Soul which make us partakers of Jesus Christ, and that without them it is not possible for us to be so, and that the dead have the same advantage we have, it cannot then be said, we receive the proper Substance of the Body, seeing on one hand according to the Hypothesis of the Church of Rome, the want of these dispositions hinders not men from receiving it, and on the other that the dead with all these their qualifications cannot receive it.

Ibid.

THIS appears by the Sequel of his reasoning, for what he say's concerning the dead, the same he say's concerning the living which dwell in Deserts, and that cannot personally come to the Lord's Table. *Jesus Christ*, say's he, *sanctifies them invisibly with this Sanctification.* How can we know this? I answer, because they have the life in themselves, and they would not have it, were they not partakers of this Mystery. For our Saviour himself has said, unless you eat the Flesh of the Son of man, and drink his Blood, you have no life in you. And for a further confirmation of this, he has caused to be brought to several of these Saints, the Gifts, by the Ministry of Angels. It is evident, he attributes to these Inhabitants of Deserts, the same participation of Jesus Christ, the same manducation of his Flesh and Blood which we receive in the Sacrament without the least difference, whence it follows, that our Communion with Jesus Christ by means of the Sacrament is purely Spiritual, and that our eating of his Flesh is Spiritual likewise, there being no need of adding the reception of his Substance into our Stomacks.

BUT yet this does more plainly appear by what follows. *The Gift*, say's he, *is indeed communicated to the living by means of the Body, but it first passes to the Substance of the Soul, and afterwards communicates it self to the Body, by the Ministry of the Soul.* Which St. Paul meant when he said, that he that is joyned to the Lord, is one and the same Spirit with him, because this Union and Conjunction is made first of all in the Soul. This being the Seat of this Sanctification which we obtain by the exercise of our virtues. This is likewise the Seat of Sin. 'Tis here wherein is the Band of Servitude, by which the Sacrament links us to God. The Body has nothing but what it derives from the Soul, and as its pollutions proceed from the evil thoughts of the heart, from the heart likewise comes its Sanctification; as well that of the Virtues, as that of the Mysteries. If then the Soul has no need of the Body, to receive Sanctification, but the Body on the contrary of the Soul, why then must the Souls which are yet cloathed with their Bodies,



*Bodies be greater partakers of the Mystery, than those stript of them?* We must be strangely prepossessed with prejudice, if we do not acknowledge that this Author only establishes the sanctifying and spiritual Communion; and not that of the proper Substance of the Body and Blood of our Saviour; for if we suppose the Bread to be the Body of Jesus Christ in Sanctification and Virtue, it is easie to comprehend what he means, but if we suppose Transubstantiation, how shall we then understand what he say's, *viz.* that the Gift is indeed received by the Body, but it immediately passes to the Soul and afterwards communicates it self from the Soul to the Body? Does not the Substance of the Body of Jesus Christ descend immediately from the Mouth into the Stomack, and does it not remain there till the change of the Species? How then shall we understand him when he say's, that our Communion with Jesus Christ is first established in the Soul? For 'tis certain, that to judge of it, in the sense of Transubstantiation, it would be established on the contrary first of all in the Body, which would be the first Subject that would receive the Substance of the Flesh and Blood of our Lord. How shall we understand the Conclusion he draws from all this Discourse, to wit, that the Souls of the dead are no less partakers of this Mystery than those of the living, for the living do communicate after two manners, Spiritually and Substantially, whereas the dead only in one? How in fine, shall we understand what he means in saying that the Body has no other Sanctification by means of the Mystery, than that which comes to it from the Soul? Is it no wise sanctifi'd by touching the proper Substance of the Son of God.

CABASILAS stay's not here, for concluding by way of Interrogation, that the Souls clothed with their Bodies do not more partake of the Mystery than those which are stript of them, he continues to demand what they have more. *Is it, say's he, that they see the Priest, and receive from him* Cap. 43. *the Gifts? But they that are out of the Body have the great Eternal High Priest, who is to them all these things; It being he indeed that administers to them that truly receive.* Was there ever any man that betrayed such a want of memory as this man does, should it be supposed he believed Transubstantiation? Could he not remember that the living have not only this advantage above the dead to behold the Priest, and receive from him the Gifts, but likewise to receive the proper Substance of their Saviour? Could not he call to mind, that the Spiritual Communion, remaining common both to the one and the others, the Substantial was particularly to the living? Moreover, what does he mean in saying, that as 'tis Jesus Christ that administers it to the dead, so it is he likewise that gives it to the living that effectually receive it? Is it that the Priest who gives the proper Substance of Jesus Christ does not truly and effectually administer it? Is it that this Substance which is called with so great an Emphasis, *the Truth and Reality*, and which Mr. Arnaud always understands, when he finds these kind of expressions, *the real Body, and Blood of Jesus Christ?* Is it, I say, that this is not a Truth?

MR. Arnaud can without doubt remove all these difficulties when he pleases, and 'tis likely he will find a way to reconcile them with the belief of Transubstantiation, seeing he himself has heretofore written, *that God admits us to the participation of the same Food which the Elect feed on to all Eternity, there being no other difference betwixt them and us, but only that here he takes from us the sensible taste and sight of it, reserving both one and the other of these for us when we come to Heaven.* He will tell us there's no body doubts, but that he is of the number of Transubstantiators, seeing he has with

Of frequent  
Com. part. 3. p.  
715.

with so much honour vanquished the Minister *Claude*, and yet that what he has maintain'd is not contradictory to the discourse of *Cabasilas*. I do verily believe his single Proposition has almost as much force as whatsoever I have mention'd from *Cabasilas*, for if there be no other difference between the participation of the Faithful on Earth, and that of the Elect in Heaven, than that of the sight and sensible taste, which we have not here, nor shall have but in Heaven, I do not see any reason wherefore Mr. *Arnaud* should so bestir himself to shew us that what we take by the Mouths of our Bodies, and which enters into our Stomacks, is the proper Substance of the Body and Blood of Christ, seeing 'tis certain the Elect in Heaven do not receive Jesus Christ in such a manner. But it being no ways reasonable that what Mr. *Arnaud* has said at one time contradictorily to what he has said at another, should serve me as a Rule for the understanding of Authors, all that I can do in his favour is this, freely to offer him to lay aside the Proof taken from *Cabasilas*, when he shall have made his Proposition to be approved of in the Court of *Rome*.

## CHAP. VII.

*That the Greeks adore not the Sacrament with an Adoration of Latria, as the Latins do, and consequently believe not Transubstantiation. The Thirteenth Proof. Mr. Arnaud's Eleventh Illusion.*

**W**E may I think already begin to doubt, whether the *Greeks* have in effect the same Sentiments with the *Latins* touching Transubstantiation, and whether the assurances Mr. *Arnaud* has given us thereof be well grounded. He appears very brisk and confident in asserting this Point, and behaves himself as a Person that has already conquered, but 'tis more than probable that these flourishes are the effects of that kind of Rhetorick which teaches men to put forth their voices in the weakest part of their cause, to the end they may obtain that by noise, which they could not by reason. But howsoever, it may now be demanded what will become of all those Historical Collections, Arguments, Attestations, Consequences, Keys, Systems, those confident Defies, and Challenges to produce any thing which had the least appearance of Truth or Reason against his Proofs, and in a word of all this great torrent of Eloquence and mundane Philosophy.

— — — *Aure*  
*Omnia disperpunt & nubibus irrita donant.*

THE Proofs I have already produced do sufficiently confirm this, but that which I shall farther offer will yet more evidence it, and at the same time discover another of Mr. *Arnaud's* Illusions: My Proof shall be taken from the *Greeks* not adoring the *Eucharist* with that Sovereign Adoration the *Latins* do. Now if this be made apparent, what likelihood is there, that a Church which otherwise is not at all scrupulous in matters of Ceremony, and which has such a great devotion for Pictures, for the Writings of the Evangelists,

gelists consecrated Bread which they call *ἀρτισταγον*, and even the Bread of the *Eucharist* before 'tis consecrated, should believe the Substance of the Symbols to be really changed into the Substance of the Body and Blood of Christ, and yet not render it that Sovereign Honour which belongs to it. It concerns us then to know what the Custom of the *Greeks* is touching this Adoration, and so much the more, because this Question being one of the chief of our Dispute, it is therefore absolutely necessary to be thoroughly inform'd in it.

**BUT** before we proceed any farther, we must distinguish (according to the sense of the *Greeks* and *Latins*) two sorts of Adoration, the one inferiour and subalternate which is rendred to Subjects, in which we do not acknowledge an infinite Majesty, and th'other a Sovereign and Highest Worship, called that of *Latria*, which is only due to God.

**WE** must likewise distinguish according to the sense of the same *Greeks* and *Latins*, an Adoration called relative, which terminates not it self in any one Subject, but passes (as it were) from one Subject to another, as thro a Channel; and an absolute Adoration, which terminates it self in that Subject which is worshipped, without a reference to any thing else.

**IN** fine there ought to be a distinction made betwixt an internal Adoration which consists in the motions of the Soul towards the Subject adored, and the external Adoration which consists in outward expressions.

**WHICH** Distinctions being premised, we are now to enquire whether the *Greeks* adore the *Eucharist* with a Sovereign Adoration, and that of *Latria*, not relatively, (as we speak) but absolutely, and in the same manner we ought to worship the proper Substance and Person of Jesus Christ. And because the internal affections of the Soul, cannot be immediately known, it therefore concerns us to enquire whether the *Greeks* do outwardly express any Sign of such an Adoration, either by their words or actions. Mr. *Arnaud* holds the affirmative and I the negative, and this being here only a question of Fact, 'tis likewise by Proofs of fact wherewith it must be decided.

**FOR** this effect I shall first here offer the testimony of a Cannon of *Cracovia* called *Sacranus*, who in reckoning up the Errors of the *Moscovits*, (whom we all know do follow the Greek Religion) does expressly mention this. *Before the Cup is prepared, say's he, they light Torches and expose to the Peoples sight with exceeding great devotion the Bread, which is to be consecrated, with the Wine and hot Water, which they pour into the Chalice. They carry these about, and the People bow down before them with the greatest testimonies of respect and veneration. But afterwards when the Bread is placed on the Altar and consecrated, there is no veneration shewed it, nor do they make any elevation of it.* *Religio. Rutkenor. art. 20.*

**JOHN** de *Lasko* Archbishop of *Gnesne*, and Ambassadour from *Poland* to *Rome* in the beginning of the last Century, makes the same relation of the Errors of the *Russians*, as *Sacranus* had done before him. It is likely by what Mr. *Arnaud* tells us, that he has only copied out what *Sacranus* wrote and appropriated it to himself, for we find their expressions to be both the same. But be it as it will, he has not forgotten this Article I now mentioned. *Raynald ad ann. 1514.*

**PETER** Scarga a Jesuit of *Vilna* in *Litvania* has written a Book against



Par. 3. cap. 2.  
art. 8.

gainst the *Greeks* and *Russians*, which he intitled, *de uno pastore*, in which, making a Catalogue of their Errors, he particularly mentions this: *As Mass they worship on their knees the Bread before 'tis consecrated, but after its Consecration they give no honour to the most Holy Body of Jesus Christ.*

SO that we have here already three Witnesses whose Testimonies are not to be rejected, seeing they are of far greater weight than the forced consequences of Mr. *Arnaud*, for they lived in those Parts, and were eye-witnesses, of what they tell us, and moreover considerable Persons in the Romish Church, the first of them being a Cannon, th'other an Archbishop, and the third a Jesuit, who do all three of them positively affirm the *Greeks* do not adore the *Eucharist* after Consecration. Behold here a fourth of the same Order, which is *Anthony Caucus* a *Venetian*, and Archbishop of *Corfou*. He had an order from Pope *Gregory XIII.* to inform himself exactly of the belief of the *Greeks*, and to make him a Relation thereof which he did. *Allatus* speaks of this Relation as if it were published. I confess I never saw it in print, but I have seen a Manuscript of it in the King's Library, wherein I found these words in the thirteenth Article of their Errors. *They yield no Reverence, Honour, Veneration, nor Worship to the most Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist consecrated with leavened Bread according to their Custom, they carry it to the sick without Lights and Torches. They keep it in their Churches in a bag hanging against a wall in a little wooden box, and yet burn Tapers before the Images of all the Saints.* He informs us elsewhere that the Greek Priests when they carry the Sacrament to the Sick, are wont to wrap it up in a linnen cloth, or Handkercher, and so put it into their bosoms without any other Ceremony. But when he sets himself to the opposing of this Error, he thus speaks. *There's no People (that I know of) who profess the Christian Religion that shew less respect and veneration to the Holy Sacrament, than the Greek Nation. They adore and reverence their leavened Bread before 'tis consecrated, even to the very idolizing of it, but after scarcely rise up to respect it. Their Priests carry the Eucharist in their bosoms to the sick, without any Lights, and that which is most absurd is, they keep it in their Churches in a little wooden box, tied up in a bag and hanged against a wall without any Lights before it, as if 'twere a profane thing to the scandalizing of all pious People. I believe they have this Custom from the Heretical Sacramentaries, who deny the virtue of this most Holy Sacrament. They are moreover so superstitious and covetous, that when deceased Persons have bequeathed them any Legacy, they light Candles before the Images of all the Saints, drawing near to them with the greatest testimonies of reverence when they enter the Churches, but they turn their backs to the Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist. I wondred to see them do thus, and being desirous to inform my self of the reason of this irreverence, shewing them how grievously they erred, in that they testifi'd a greater respect to the Saints who are the servants and friends of our Saviour than to himself, who is their Lord and Master. These Papa's gave me no other answer but that there was no command which enjoyned this respect and adoration. This answer is Heretical as I shall hereafter manifest, for John Oecolampadus (that arch-Heretic of our time the ring-leader of the Sacramentaries, asserted that our Saviour was not contain'd in the Sacrament of the Eucharist) has likewise written and publicly taught that we ought in no wise to adore the Eucharist with an Adoration of Latria, terming all them idolaters that did so. Wherefore let Catholicks judge whether this does not well agree with the Opinion of the *Greeks*.*

IT will be thought perhaps, this Author speaks only of some particular

lar Persons and not of the Greek Church in general, but such Persons may be soon satistf'd when they read what follows towards the end of his Relation, *Behold most Holy Father*, say's he, *all the Heresies of the Modern Greeks which I have laid open and confuted as well as I could. I say the Heresies of the Greeks, not only of the Inhabitants of Corfou, but of all the Eastern Greeks, to the end the others may not magnifie themselves, for they have all the same belief, the same will, and obstinacy, to maintain every where the same things.* And here I think is another good Witness, being likewise an Archbishop, and a Person that wanted neither Wit nor Learning, who dwelt among the Greeks. He affirms precisely as well as the rest, that the Greeks do not adore the Sacrament. He proceeds farther and lays this to their charge as a crime, and aggravates it by comparing it with the respect they shew the Images; he relates their Reasons, there being no command enjoying this Adoration. He condemns this Opinion as Heretical, and likens it unto that of the chief of Hereticks; he farther tells us, that this is not only the opinion of some particular Persons, but of all the Eastern Greeks, and in short he remarks the irreverences which are directly opposit to all kinds of Adoration. What can be more expressive, and what can Mr. *Arnaud* reply to this? Will he call again here to his assistance *Allatius* who disputes against *Caucus*; and would have it believed that this Archbishop has falsely charged the Greeks. But besides that it cannot be shewed by what interest *Caucus* should be moved to form such an accusation contrary to the respect he owed the Pope, and that his testimony is found conformable to that of several others, it is certain that *Allatius* himself is of all men the most passionate and least sincere, frequently denying and affirming things according to his own Capricio, or rather Interest, and that which likewise is most considerable, is, that *Allatius* who meddles with other Articles dared not touch in particular on this, so that his silence is a confirmation of what I say.

THE Jesuit that wrote the Relation touching St. *Erinis*, affirms almost the same thing as *Caucus*. *A great abuse*, say's he, *has crept in amongst the Greeks. For when the Priest comes from the lesser Altar to the Offertory, to pass on to the great one, all the People there present adore the Bread which is not yet consecrated, and shew a greater devotion during this action, than in or after the time of Consecration; for in the time of the Consecration they put out the Torches which they lighted for the Offertory.* And in another place, *We see by what has been said in the foregoing Chapters how greatly the Greeks are to blame for the little respect they yield to this adorable Sacrament, seeing that having consecrated on Holy Thursday a great quantity of Particles, they keep them all the year in a little wooden box inclosed in a bag, and hanged on a nail over the Altar, or behind an Image, without a light or any other mark of veneration. When they enter into the Church to say their Prayers, you may see 'em make a profound bow, before the Images of our Lord, or Virgin Mary, or some other Saint, but you will never see them prostrate themselves before this adorable Sacrament. We have often reprehended them for this fault, and some have promised to amend it, others are really sensible of the unseemliness of this their carriage; but being loath to appear singular in their Devotions, they choose rather to follow the Customs of an ignorant People than to render themselves up to reason. So great force has ill examples over weak minds. Some time since the Lady Margareta D'argenta, a Person both devout and eloquent, told me, that being in company with some Greeks, she sharply rebuked them upon this occasion; you Greeks really show your selves, said she, in matters of Religion, to be void of sense, not knowing to whom you owe your respects, nor to whom to direct your*

Relation of  
the Isle of St.  
*Erinis* cap. 12  
pag. 142.

Cap. 10.

*Prayers.* On one hand you acknowledge that *Jefus* Christ who is God and Man, our Creator and Redeemer, is really in the Sacrament, with all the Treasures of his Graces, and on the other, we can see you show him not any reverence answerable to the respect of his Majesty. I have been several times in your Churches, and having sought the only object of my affection, and the God of my heart, I found, you keep him close shut in a wooden box, hanging up in a little bag on a nail covered with dust and cobwebs. A Saviour in a pitiful box, an Infinite Majesty in the dust, an Almighty God in a bag, hanged on a nail! He is not thus treated amongst us, you may see him receive an other kind of usage, shewing him far greater respect than this. Our Priests keep him in a silver Pyx, he rests in a Tabernacle gilded without, and within covered with Sattin, and to shew that we believe he is the Light which light'neth our Understandings, and enflameth our Affections, we have Lamps always burning day and night before him. When we come into our Churches we set not our selves upon considering the several Pictures and other Ornaments, for our affections do immediately lead us to the place where we believe our Treasure is. Whereas you keep your selves standing like the Pharisees, and we fall on our knees with the Publican.

THAT which the Jesuit makes this woman speak concerning the *Greeks* believing the real Presence, is forged by him without any grounds in the fence wherein he takes it, that is to say, as a *Substantial Presence*, for 'tis certain the *Greeks* do not thus understand it. But whatsoever he otherwise tells us is matter of fact which he has seen himself, and concerning the truth of which we have no reason to doubt. Now these Facts are such, that we cannot but judge them inconsistent with the belief of adoring the Sacrament of the *Eucharist* with such a Supreme Adoration as is due to the Son of God alone.

Mr. Haye's  
Voyages, part.  
49.

THE Author that wrote Mr. De la Haye's *Voyages* the French Ambassador, observes the same thing as the others concerning the linnen bag, and that they hang it on a nail behind the Altar, wherein they put the consecrated Particles. He says he thus saw it at *Selivree*, and several other places. But because this remark might offend his Readers, he has therefore attributed the cause thereof to the great poverty of the *Greeks*; but this is but a false colour, for the *Greeks* are not so poor, but that they may keep the *Eucharist* in a more decent manner, did they believe it to be the proper Substance of *Jesus* Christ. The true reason of this Custom, is, that they do not believe what the *Latins* do, (or as speaks *Caucus*) they do not believe there is any command which enjoyns them to reverence the Sacrament according to the mode of the *Latins*.

Thervenot's  
Voyages, part.  
2 ch. 77.

MR. *Thervenot* an exact and inquisitive Traveller, gives us an account of the manner, which the Patriarch of *Alexandria* uses in celebrating the Sacrament; but in all his Relation there is not a word of Adoration, and he is even forced to say, *that they do in truth behave themselves with less respect at the Communion than the Latins.*

Montconis's  
Voyages, p.  
228. &c.

MR. *de Montconis* describes likewise very exactly the Divine Service, which he saw perform'd by a Greek Archbishop at Mount *Sinai*; and observes not any thing which shews they adored the Sacrament.

MR. *Arnaud* who has seen the use which might be made of the express Testimonies by which it appears the *Greeks* adore not the Sacrament, and several



Several other Proofs which might be added, and which conclude the same thing, has betook himself to his usual Artifices. First of all he has avoided the handling of the question touching the Adoration, as a means whereby to clear up that of Transubstantiation, or the real Presence. He on the contrary handles it only as a necessary consequence of it, I would say, that instead of arguing thus, the *Greeks* give to the Sacrament the Supreme Honour which is due to Jesus Christ; they believe therefore that the Sacrament is Jesus Christ in propriety of Substance, he reasons on the contrary after this manner, the *Greeks* believe Transubstantiation and the real Presence, therefore they adore the Sacrament. Now I say there is a great deal of deceit in this method, for although Transubstantiation may be used, when 'tis agreed 'tis believed, as a means whereby to conclude, that those who believe it adore it, yet who sees not, that in this debate wherein I deny both one and the other of these to Mr *Arnaud*, it had been a more just and natural course to begin with the Adoration as a means whereby to conclude Transubstantiation? For Adoration is a thing which discovers it self by outward acts, a publick Rite wherein a whole Church agrees, and consequently is more sensible and apparent, and more easily known than an Article of Faith, concerning which we must consult the Writings of the Learned, judge of Persons, and weigh their expressions. It is certainly a great deal easier for us to know whether the *Greeks* give the same honour to the Sacrament which the Church of *Rome* does, or one equivalent thereunto, than to know what their belief is touching the Substantial Conversion. We may be imposed on by this last, for there may be forged attestations produced, and hunger-starv'd *Greeks* brought in as witnesses, whom a small pension will byass either way; or the Decrees of Latinis'd Synods offer'd us for those of the *Greeks*. A Consul zealous for his Religion may easily give or admit a change. The testimony of a false Greek may be alledged, as of that of a true one, and moreover 'tis no hard matter to dazle peoples eyes by a long train of Narrations and Arguments. But it is not so easie a matter to make use of all these false colours in the point of the Adoration. In a word, it plainly appears that Mr. *Arnaud*'s design was to send back this Article to his Treatise of Consequences, to hinder us from treating of it according to our method of Proofs.

THE second thing he does, seems to correct the first; for he pretends to establish this Adoration by particular Proofs, which he calls gross Proofs, to distinguish them from that other more fine and slender Proof, which he draws from the real Presence. He immediately produces a passage of *Cabasilas* in these Terms, *The faithful, desirous to shew their Faith, in receiving the Communion do adore, bless, and praise Jesus Christ as God, who is manifested in the Gifts.* I answer, he ought faithfully to translate this passage. *Cabasilas* speaks of the Gifts, and say's, *That the Faithful adore, bless, and praise Jesus Christ, who is understood in them,* τὸ ἐν αὐτοῖς νοούμενον ἢ ὁ Θεός. Now a man must be very little conversant amongst Greek Authors not to know, that when the question is concerning the Symbols, νοούμενον, or the τὸ νοούμεν, signifies the Spiritual and Mystical Object, represented by the outward Sign. Jesus Christ then being represented by the Gifts, is adored according to *Cabasilas*, and not the Gifts themselves. Which is what I observ'd in my Answer to the *Perpetuity*. Mr. *Arnaud* would have me before I make use of this passage to consider all that he has taken out of this Author to shew he believed the real Presence. For, say's he, *Cabasilas asserts in his Book that our Saviour Christ is really present in the Sacrament, and shews us in this passage we ought to adore him in the Gifts. Therefore does he teach the Adoration of the Eucharist.* I answer,

swer, that *Cabasilas* neither teaches Transubstantiation nor the real Presence, as I shall make appear in its place, and had the Author of the *Perpetuity* alledged the passages cited by Mr. *Arnaud*, we should not have been wanting to examine them, but the question then in hand only concerning the Adoration, I could not without great injustice tire the Reader with a long Dispute about the real Presence, before I could alledge one formal passage touching the Subject I handled.

*Lib. 10. cap. 9.*

MR. *Arnaud* tells us afterwards, that *Cabasilas* blames those that adore before the Consecration the *Gifts* which are carri'd about, and that speak to them as to our Saviour himself, and approves they should give the same respect to the *Eucharist* after its Consecration. I answer, that the *Greeks* prostrate themselves before the Book of the Gospels and speak to it, as to our Saviour himself, and yet it cannot hence be concluded, they adore the Book it self with an absolute Adoration, as if the Book were in effect our Saviour himself. *Cabasilas* likes they should do the same thing in respect of the consecrated *Gifts*, but does not approve they should do it before their Consecration, altho he already acknowledges them to be Types and Figures, because he would have a difference made, they being not as yet the Body and Blood of Christ. But this is not to say they ought to give to the *Gifts*, either before or after their Consecration, an honour which terminates it self in them alone.

*Ibid.*

AS to what he alledges out of *Simeon de Thessalonica*, we have no other assurance of the truth of these passages than the bare word of *Allatius*, that is to say, of a passionate man, ready to assert and maintain any thing right or wrong, for the interest of the Court of *Rome*. We shall have occasion to speak more of him hereafter, but in the mean time shall only say, that the words of *Simeon* be they what they will, do not conclude, we ought to yield the *Gifts* an absolute honour, which terminates it self in that Substance which the Priest carries on his head when he enters into the Church.

Second part,  
*pag. 257.*

THE passage the Author of the *Perpetuity* quoted, as of *Gabriel de Philadelphia* was more specious, but because *Cardinal Perron* (from whom 'twas borrow'd) does not recite the Greek Text, and *Arcudius* who relates some clauses thereof, describes him as a Person void of all kinds of Learning, either in Divinity, Philosophy, or Grammar, and that moreover the same *Arcudius* assures us, the *Greeks* do give very little honour if any at all to the Sacrament after its Consecration, I therefore said I would suspend my Judgment till I could ascertain my self by reading the Book it self.

Answer to the  
2. Treat. of  
*Perp* 2. part.  
*cap. 8.*

MR. *Arnaud* who is ever upon his Criticisms, and willingly passes over the matter, that he might fasten on the Person, imagines he has found here a lucky occasion to triumph over me. But I am sorry to find my self oblig'd to disturb his Enjoyments, which I would not do, could I well avoid it. I affirm then first, I had reason to suspend my Judgment, because that to judge aright of the sense of an Author, it is not sufficient that we see a passage translated into French by *Cardinal Perron*. For besides that, his Translations are not always very exact, as several have observ'd, no more than those of the Office of the Blessed Sacrament (according to their Relations that have examin'd them,) 'tis probable this passage of *Gabriel* has been already made to his hand, by Persons unknown to us, and for whose Fidelity he was not willing to answer. In effect forasmuch as he has not inserted the Greek in the Margent,

as he has done in the most part of his other Quotations, may justly give us a shrewd suspicion of this. Moreover we meet therein with the Term of *Transubstantiation* which Mr. *Arnaud* himself confesses is not an usual expression with the *Greeks*. There is likewise mention therein of the Accidents of Bread which remain, which is not the usual Style of the *Greeks*. I have then wrong'd no body when I suspended my Judgment, but have rather done what I and every man else ought to do in the like occasion. I was not oblig'd to ask Mr. *Arnaud's* leave for this, altho he pretends I was; for he is not the Sovereign Arbitratour of Affairs which are treated of in the Empire of Reason, there being several things which pass there, in which he takes no part.

*B U T*, say's he, Arcudius Mr. Claude's great Author relates several passages out of *Gabriel* which are as expressive as that now in question. I answer, that what *Arcudius* relates obliges me yet more to suspend my Judgment, because that in it there are several Contradictions and manifest Absurdities, as I shewed in my Answer to Father *Novet*, which the Reader may consult, if he desires information touching this particular.

*I* confess, adds Mr. *Arnaud*, that having not the least reason to doubt of the Sentiment of this Author touching the passages produced by *Arcudius*, I have therefore avoided giving my self the trouble to inquire after his Book. And I for my part profess I am not so easily satisfi'd, for I cannot thus take things upon trust. What shall we say, every one has his way, Mr. *Arnaud's* humour is immediately to catch hold of any thing, but mine is not so hasty, and indeed I never had cause to repent of my slowness in this particular, reckoning it to be the best way to prevent mistakes. Not that I would have him put himself to the trouble of seeking after this Book of *Gabriel's*, as he has proffer'd me to do, for our Dispute may be as well carri'd on without this Archbishop, whose Book, (if we will believe *Arcudius*) is a very extravagant one, and the Civilities of such a Person as Mr. *Arnaud* is, may be expected in a weightier occasion.

*B U T* as we must not suffer our selves to be prevail'd on by his kindness, so neither must we suffer our selves to be run down by his Injuries. For he charges me, with disingenuously suppressing *Arcudius* his words, which would have discovered the true sence of what I cited. He chages me with likewise impertinently designing to invalidate the Testimony of *Gabriel* by that of *Arcudius*. I must then justify my self concerning these two particulars. The first of which will be soon dispatched by considering, that having in the first Edition of my Books only set down in the Margent the particular places of those Authors where are to be found the passages I made use of, I have in the last Edition inserted these passages themselves in full length, according as they are in the Original. Now that very place of *Arcudius* in question, may be seen there set down at large, together, with the Clause which Mr. *Arnaud* say's I have suppressed. Let but any man take the pains to read the 296 page, and he shall find these very words therein, *Nam etiam postea in elevatione Sacratissima Hostia quantumvis eam non aspiciant, quamprimum tamen Sacerdos ea verba protulerit, τα ἅγια τοῖς ἁγίοις, sancta sanctis, statim procumbunt & cultu Latria adorant*, which are the same words Mr. *Arnaud* makes his efforts upon. This is then a groundless Accusation, for he cannot alledge he knew not of this Edition, seeing he has mention'd it himself in the Eighth Chapter of his Seventh Book, upon occasion of the Council at *Nice*.

*B U T*,



BUT, it will be demanded, perhaps why I did not insert into the Body of my Discourse these words of *Arcudius* which do so plainly manifest his meaning. I answer, that if I had argued on the sense of *Arcudius*, I should have been to blame in not alledging whatsoever might give light to this sense. For when we would draw a true consequence, we ought to establish the Principle in a clear and perfect manner, to take away all occasion of mistakes. But Mr. *Arnaud* needs not be told what kind of Person this *Arcudius* is, being a Greek latiniz'd Priest, brought up at *Rome* in the Seminary of the *Greeks*, extremely passionate for the Interests of the Roman Church, having wrote a Book particularly against the Protestants, to persuade us that the *Greeks* are at agreement with the *Latins*, as to what concerns the Sacraments in all essential Points. I cannot then otherwise alledge *Arcudius* than to confront him with himself concerning some Truths and Matters of Fact, which do now and then escape him, after the same manner as I would quote *Cardinal Perron*, and *Bellarmin*, and Mr. *Arnaud* himself, not as witnesses that believe what I would conclude, but as Persons who affirm things, from whence I conclude what they themselves do not believe. And thus does Mr. *Arnaud* quote *Mestrezat* and *Daille*, and sundry others of our Authors. Now 'tis evident that when the Testimony of an Adversary is alledged in this respect, a man is not obliged to set down what has been his Sentiment at the bottom, nor to relate all the words which may make it known, for this piece of impertinence would be good for nothing, but to tire the Reader's patience and trifle away the time. It is sufficient if what is alledged from them be true. Mr. *Arnaud* therefore has very unjustly accused me, seeing I published this illustration in my Answer to Father *Noël*, which altho well known to him; yet has it not stoppt him in his career, concealing my Justification, neither more nor less than if I had said nothing.

*Arcud. lib. 3.  
cap. 21.*

*Book 10. chap.  
9.*

IT only then remains to know whether what I alledged from *Arcudius* be sufficient to conclude, that the *Greeks* adore not the *Eucharist*, notwithstanding whatsoever the same *Arcudius* has elsewhere asserted. Which is what I take upon me to maintain. He say's, *that when the Priest consecrates the Gifts, in saying, this is my Body, this is my Blood, he then shews them little or no respect at all, he bows not his head, neither does he adore them, nor prostrate himself before them, nor lights Candles, nor makes any Reverence.* Mr. *Arnaud* answers, the question concerns not the Adoration in it self, but the time of the Adoration, that we must distinguish betwixt a voluntary Adoration and an Adoration of Rite or Ceremony; that the first is one and the same both with the *Greeks* and *Latins*, because it chiefly consists in acknowledging the *Eucharist* to be the Body of Christ with an inward Submission, which both one and the other do, as soon as the Consecration is performed, that as to what concerns the second, the *Latins* immediately perform it after the Consecration, and the *Greeks* later, to wit, at the Elevation of the Hoste, which is done a little before the Priest disposes himself to communicate.

THAT we may examine this Answer, we must lay aside this voluntary Adoration of which he speaks, for it has no other foundation in relation to the *Greeks*, than his bare word, or at most the Proofs he supposes he has given of their Belief touching the real Presence; but this is what's in question, and we cannot yet suppose the solidity of his Proofs. To colour over this pretended distinction of a voluntary Adoration, and an Adoration of Rite, he should shew us that the *Greeks* do give at least at some time to the *Eucharist*

rist immediately after Consecration this honour he calls voluntary, and that in their intention, this is a sovereign honour. But to tell us as he does that this honour chiefly consists in acknowledging the *Eucharist* to be the Body of Christ with an inward reverence, and to persuade us the *Greeks* do this, is a plain abuse, for what is this but a setting us upon penetrating into mens hearts, and guessing at their thoughts? Those that have this inward reverence to the *Eucharist*, do certainly shew it by some outward Sign, and the *Greeks* shewing none, Mr. *Arnaud* cannot ground what he say's on any thing, unless it be upon some particular revelation he has had of this matter.

*SACRANUS*, *Scarga*, and *Caucus*, who lived amongst the *Greeks*, were ignorant of this pretended inward reverence, for had they known any thing of it, they would not have been so positive in asserting the *Greeks* do shew no Reverence, Respect, or Adoration to the *Eucharist* after its Consecration; nor would they call them, as they have done, Heretical, and Prophane People. Even the *Greeks* themselves who answer'd *Caucus* there was no command which enjoyn'd this Adoration, knew nothing of this. This inward Reverence had its residence and operations in their Souls, and yet they knew nothing of it; for had they known it, they would never return such an Answer. None but Mr. *Arnaud* knew this secret; but if he gives us not other Proofs, it is to be feared, his voluntary Adoration will be taken for one of his own private conceits.

WE must come then to this Adoration of Rite, or Ceremony, which is used, as he say's, at the Elevation of the Hoste, and see whether it is an Adoration of *Latria* which terminates in the Sacrament it self. Now I cannot but admire these Gentlemens Ingenuity with whom I am concerned. The Greek Liturgy has these words, *That the Priest and Deacon adore three times, in saying thrice with a low voice, O God be propitious unto me a sinner.* The Author of the *Perpetuity* would have these three Adorations refer to the Sacrament, wherefore he say's, *that the Priest adores, and the Deacon likewise three times in the place where they are, in saying thrice softly, Lord be propitious to me a sinner.* My Answer was, *that I found in Goar's Book of Rites and Ceremonies, not this Term of Lord, but that of God, which shews that this Adoration terminated it self in God, and not in the Sacrament.* Mr. *Arnaud* who cannot deny this Truth, leaves out the Priest's Prayer which discovers his deceit, and contents himself with alledging these words of the Liturgy, *then the Priest bows and the Deacon likewise, and a little while after the People in general do reverently bow.* Leaving it to be believed that these Adorations do certainly terminate themselves in the *Eucharist*. But he ought to proceed sincerely; it is true that then the Priest and Deacon do adore, but it is likewise as true that their Adoration addresses it self to God in these express Terms, *Ὁ θεός ἰλασθήτω μοι τὰ ἁμαρτήματα, O God be propitious to me a sinner,* from whence 'tis plainly apparent there can be no such thing concluded as the Adoration of the *Eucharist*.

AS to *Arcudius's* Testimony (who tells us, *that the People prostrate themselves on the ground, as soon as they hear the Priest say, Sancta Sanctis, Holy Things are for Holy Persons, and that they adore the Sacrament with an Adoration of Latria*) we need not be much concerned thereat, being a Person prepossessed, and one who testifies of a thing whereof he is altogether ignorant, *Goar* in not. in *S Joan. Cery- being brought into Italy when he was but ten years of age.* In effect what he say's *153.*

concerning the Peoples prostrating themselves on the ground, as soon as they hear the Priest say, *Sancta Sanctis* is not true, for the Liturgy denotes this Adoration of the People before the *Sancta Sanctis*, at the same time as the Priest and Deacon adore, immediately after this Prayer, *Look upon us O Lord Jesus Christ our God*, &c. But granting it were so that the People prostrated themselves in the time the *Sancta Sanctis* was said, it would not thence follow that their Adoration terminated it self in the Sacrament. They would worship God, as does the Deacon in the words I now mention'd, *O God be propitious*, &c. Or our Saviour in Heaven as they do in the Prayer, which I likewise now mention'd which precedes the *Sancta Sanctis*, *Look down O Lord our God from the Holy Place of thy Dwelling*. They prostrate themselves before the Images of the Saints, before the Book of the Gospels, before the Bread when as yet unconsecrated, and yet no Body concludes hence, they adore these things with an absolute Adoration. Why then will *Arcudius* have them to adore the *Eucharist* with an Adoration terminating it self in it?

BUT if *Arcudius's* Testimony be of no validity in reference to this last Article, wherefore must it be otherwise in respect of this other Article on which I ground my Conclusion? I answer, for two Reasons, the one, for that being interess'd as he is against us, it is not to be imagin'd he would speak any thing in our favour, unless the thing were so well known and undeniably true, that he could not disguise it; or pass it over in silence; and th'other because that in effect his Testimony in this respect, agrees with the Liturgy of the *Greeks*, which expresses no kind of Adoration directed to the *Eucharist* immediately after its Consecration. And there being no mention likewise of any such thing afterwards to the end of the Office, the Conclusion I draw hence is undeniable. Had the *Greeks* the same Sentiments as the *Latins*, and made profession of rendring the same Divine honours to the Substance of the Sacrament which are due only to the proper Person of the Son of God, what time could they choose better for the acquitting themselves of this Duty than that in which he begins to be present on the Altar? When a Prince comes into a place, People are not wont to delay the shewing him the respect due to him, every one stands immediately uncovered in his Presence, and those Persons that did otherwise would be esteemed foolish and stupid. What likelihood is there then, did the Greek Church believe, that immediately after the Consecration, the Bread becomes the very Substance of the Body of our Lord, she would defer any longer to acknowledge it to be so, by a Solemn Adoration? Mr. *Arnaud* must not tell us, that the Priest's mind is so taken up with the *Idea* of the Sacrifice, that it is all this while fixed in Heaven. These are Reasonings invented, expressly to excuse a thing which cannot be alter'd, but in truth, it is so natural, to Persons that believe Transubstantiation to shew immediately the Signs of Adoration to that Object they have before their eyes, that notwithstanding all these fine Reasons, those who compiled the Liturgy of the *Greeks* would never have been wanting in this particular had they believed the aforementioned Doctrine. So that this very consideration of the *Greeks* not having ordain'd any solemn kind of Reverence or Worship to the Sacrament after its Consecration is alone sufficient to make us conclude what we contend for.

M R. *Arnaud* who indeed has no reason to rest satisfi'd with his first Proofs, has recourse to his Baron of *Spartaris* and *Paysius Ligaridins*, that is to say, to two false *Greeks*, brought up in the Faith of the Roman Church; and



and won to its interest, as will appear hereafter. I only wonder he is not ashamed to bring for witnesses such kind of People as these are.

AS to Oderborne the *Lutheran* (who discoursing of the *Russians*, tells us, *That the Priest leaving the Altar to shew the People the Eucharist, the People kneel down, and the Priest say's in the Moscovit's Language, Loe here the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ whom the Jews put to death altho innocent,*) it is easie to perceive he is deceived in taking for an Adoration of the *Eucharist*, a Devotion which they practise before its Consecration, when the Bread is carri'd, from the Prothesis to the great Altar. There can be rais'd no scruple concerning the truth of this, seeing we have the Testimony of all Authors who by unanimous consent observe, that this Ceremony is performed before the Consecration of the Symbols.

ALEXANDER. Gagnin, say's, *That one of them carries the Bread* Moscovit. de Script. cap. 2. *which is prepared for the Sacrifice, and another the Cup full of Wine, that they issue out of the Sanctuary thro a little door with other Priests that carry the Images of St. Peter, St. Nicholas, and Michael the Archangel, whilst in the mean time the People express their Devotion by Acclamations and Acts of Worship, that some of 'em cry out, Lord have pity on us, others knock their foreheads against the Ground, and that others make often the Sign of the Cross, and bow their heads, in fine that they render to the Symbols which are carri'd about sundry marks of veneration and honour. That having went round the Church, they enter again thro the Gate which is in the middle of the Quire into the Sanctuary, and there make the Sacrifice. Sigismond Baron of Herberstein, say's likewise,* Comment. IV Mosco. *That before they consecrate the Bread according to our manner, they walk with it about the Church, worship it, and adore it with a certain form of words they utter.*

ARCUDIUS, who inveighs so earnestly against this Custom as an Idolatrous practice, attributes it not only to the *Greeks*, but likewise to the *Russians*, and say's, *That they prostrate themselves and knock their heads against the Ground.* M. Habert Bishop of Vabres, say's, *That in the Greek Churches* Pontif. Eccl. Gr. observat. XI. ad partem. 7. litt. *the People make a low bow, but in other Churches, as in those at Russia, they prostrate themselves on the ground after the same manner, as if our Saviour's real Body pass'd along.* We have already observ'd that *Sacranus* and *Scarga* do expressly refer this Devotion to the Bread when as yet unconsecrated as well as others, and moreover add, that the *Russians* shew no reverence to the Sacrament after its Consecration. And in effect we do not find they go twice round the Church, whence it follows that Oderborne was mistaken, and supposed this respect was given the Bread after its Consecration; for there being but one turn made round the Church, it cannot be denied but 'tis done before the Consecration. What I say is so well known, that *Allatius* himself censures a Protestant named *Ferom Visser*, for saying, the *Greeks* carry the Body of our Saviour in Procession twice about the Church; So far are they, say's he, *from carrying the Eucharist twice about the Church, that on the contrary they carry it not at all, for that which they carry from the Prothesis, to the great Altar which they call the great Entry, is no more than Bread and Wine unconsecrated.* Allatide Perp. Conf. lib. 3. cap. 15.

AND these are Mr. *Arnaud's* gross Proofs, as he calls 'em, for I meddle not here with what he tells us concerning a Letter from Mr. *Pomponne*. We shall examine that in the following Book. His fine Proofs (as he terms them) are those he draws from the real Presence in supposing the *Greeks* hold it.

Book 10 chap.  
9 pag. 76.

For, say's he, whoſoever believes Jeſus Chriſt to be preſent in the Eucharift, ſpeaks to him as God, implores his aſſiſtance, begs his pardon, excites himſelf by expreſſions of confidence in him, acknowledges his own unworthineſs, and all theſe actions being external are outward expreſſions of Adoration. So that to bring Proofs of the Adoration of the Eucharift, there needs no more to be done, but only to produce all the Prayers contain'd in the Liturgies which are offer'd to our Saviour after the Conſecration. But it has been already obſerved that this is one of Mr. Arnaud's Illuſions, who is not willing to handle the Queſtion of the Adoration, as a means whereby to decide that of the ſubſtantial Converſion, but rather as a Conſequence thereof; ſo that all the force of his pretended Proofs conſiſting in ſuppoſing the Greeks believe Tranſubſtantiation and the real Preſence, there needs no more to be done, for the overthrowing them, than to ſend him to the refutation of theſe Arguments, by which he pretends he has eſta bliſh'd his Principle; and even this very conſideration that he could not form his Proof without making this ſuppoſition, will only confirm what we maintain, viz. that the Greeks adore not the Sacrament, whence it follows they do not believe 'tis the proper Subſtance of the Son of God, for 'tis not likely a Church that holds this Opinion, would be wanting to give to the Sacrament thoſe outward expreſſions of reverence which would diſtinguiſh themſelves eaſily, from all other kinds of honour. The Church of Rome furniſhes us with an example of this, on which we need only caſt our eyes, for it clearly appears by her words and actions, that the honour ſhe gives the Eucharift is a ſovereign and divine honour, ſuch as is due to God alone. Had the Greek Church deſign'd to ſhew it the ſame reſpect, what ſhould hinder it from doing as the Roman Church does? Would ſhe not at leaſt endeavour to imitate its example in ſeveral particulars? Why do they not carry it to the ſick with the ſame ſolemnity as thoſe of the Church of Rome? Wherefore, I ſay, does not the Greek Church enjoyn her Children to kneel as oft as they ſhall meet the Sacrament? Why does ſhe not openly expoſe it in publick rejoycings or afflictions? Wherefore does ſhe not carry it about in Proceſſion? Why not dedicate a particular Feſtival to it? Mr. Arnaud may tell us as long as he pleaſes, That there is no natural coherence between theſe things and the Adoration, that the Inſtitution of theſe Ceremonies is pious and commendable, but nowiſe neceſſary, and that the Adoration may ſubſiſt without them, as it does in effect in all the Eaſt. When there were not a natural coherence between Adoration and each of theſe particular Cuſtoms, yet would it be (me thinks) contrary to nature that the Adoration ſhould ſubſiſt ſeperated from all theſe things in general; ſeeing theſe are in a manner almoſt the ſame external marks of Divine Worſhip, which People have ever rendred to ſome viſible Object. What likelihood is there if the Greeks had the ſame Sentiments as the Latins touching this Sacrament, but they would adopt ſome one of theſe Devotions which are ſo familiar to the Latins, eſpecially thoſe that approach the neareſt their uſual Cuſtoms, and which are moreover very proper to expreſs this ſovereign honour now in queſtion, as is that ſolemn Feaſt called God's Feſtival, with all its Pomp. But ſo far have they been from imitating the Church of Rome in this particular, that they have on the contrary ſhewed the greateſt averſion to it, as appears by the Confeſſion of Metrophanus Citropulus made at Helmſtað in the year 1625. We carry not about the Streets, ſay's he, this Holy Myſtery, unleſſ it be to the ſick, it being not given us to make a ſhow of it, but to be religiously received for the remiſſion of ſins according to the words of our Saviour. All Hiſtorians are agreed that the Ruſſians do not obſerve this Feſtival. Sigifmond in his Commentaries touching Moſcovia and Gagnin, in his Deſcripti-

Confeſſ. Eccleſ.  
Orient. cap. 9.  
de cana Dom.

on of this same Country do expressly take notice of it. But that which most considerable is, That when those amongst them, who were subject to the King of Poland were forc'd to reunite themselves to the Roman Church, which hap'n'd in the year 1595. under Pope Clement the Eighth they made this Contract. *That they should not be compelled to make any Procession on the Festival of the Body of Jesus Christ, because they had other Customs amongst them in reference to the Sacrament.*

*Hamber Sum  
contr. 1. 11. Tbb.  
2 Jesu lib 6. p.  
3. c. 1. Thom. 2  
Jesu. lib.*

WHEREUPON a Learned man of the Roman Church being consulted, gave this Answer, *That as to the carrying or not carrying of the Sacrament about in Procession, that was not to be much regarded, but there were several other things of greater importance touching the Sacrament to be considered.*

THIS Person, although he spake not fully his mind, yet said enough to make us understand him. For he means, (if I mistake not) that did the matter concern only the Festival of the Sacrament it signified little, but that the unwillingness these People shewed to observe this Feast, did sufficiently evidence they had not the same Sentiment in the main with the *Latins* touching the *Eucharist*. And in effect wherefore should they refuse to observe this Feast, did they believe the Sacrament to be the proper Substance of the Son of God, and adored it with an Adoration of *Latria*? Were they afraid of giving it too much honour? Why not conform in this particular with the Roman Church, seeing they were reunited to her, and had left the *Greeks*? Is not this an evident token, that the *Greeks* cannot accommodate themselves to the Adoration practis'd by the *Latins*, nor consequently to the Doctrine they teach, and on which this Adoration is established.

BUT when what I said should have no ground, and the Adoration might subsist without these Ceremonies, Mr. Arnaud ought at least to shew us they substituted some others equivalent to them, which were to the *Greeks* the same as those we speak of are to the *Latins*. But Mr. Arnaud takes no notice of this. He thinks it sufficient, to tell me, *I am fall'n into a condition void of reason and common sense, that I make extravagant and ridiculous Conclusions, and that he is both ashamed and sorry for me, that he laughs at my Arguments, being such little Sophistries as are not fit to be offered by a judicious Person, and that my audaciousness is beyond example in denying the Greeks adore the Eucharist.* These are his usual Civilities, which yet shall not make me change my humour. I hope he will be one day of a better mind, and to that end I shall deal with him, not only in a calm and gentle manner, as it becomes a man of my Profession, but offer up my Prayers unto Almighty God for him.

BUT before I finish this Chapter, I am obliged to tell him, he could not do his Cause a greater Injury than to cite as he has done on this Subject of the Adoration of the *Eucharist*, a passage taken from Stephen Stylite, who told the Emperour Copronymus, *That the Christians adore, and kiss, the Anti-Types of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ.* Either he has not examined this Passage, or his prejudice has hind'ed him from observing what is as clear as the day, to wit, that Stephen attributes no more to the *Eucharist* than an inferiour and relative Adoration, such as is given to Images, the Cross and consecrated Vessels, whose matter is not adored. And this appears throughout the whole sequel of his Discourse. The Emperor accused him for being an Idolater in that he adored Images. He answers that his Adoration related



Vita S. Stephani junioris auct. Damascen. Bilibii.

related not to the matter of the Image, but to the Original which the Image represented. And to shew that this kind of Adoration is not Idolatry (altho addressed to a thing made with hands and senseless) he alledges the example of the Cross, holy Garments and Vessels which are likewise adored, and in fine that of the *Eucharist*. Loe here his words which justify what I say. *What crime do we commit when we represent by an Image the humane shape of Jesus Christ who has been seen, and whom we worship? Is this to adore a Creature, or do you think it may be truly said that we adore the Matter, when we adore a Cross be it made of what stuff it will? We adore the Holy Vestments and Sacred Vessels, without incurring any censure, for we are persuaded that by Prayer they are changed into Holy Things. Will you banish likewise from the Church the Anti-Types of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, because they are the Image and true Figure of this Body and Blood? We worship, and kiss, them and by partaking of them obtain Sanctification.* Either Mr. Arnaud's Friends have deceived him (if he has quoted this Author only from their Relation) or he has deceiv'd himself, or which is worse he has design'd to deceive others, when he produc'd this passage; for 'tis certain, that hence arises a clear Demonstration that the *Greeks* do not adore the *Eucharist* with that supreme and absolute Adoration now in question, and which terminates it self in that Substance we receive. There needs little strength of reasoning to make this Conclusion, and as little Meditation to comprehend it. We need only observe that this man endeavours to defend from the imputation of Idolatry the Adoration given to Images, by the example of the Adoration of the *Eucharist*, and ranks in the same order, the Adoration given to the Cross, to the sacred Vestments, to the Vessels of the Church, to Images, with that given to the *Eucharist*. We need only take notice that he calls for this effect the *Eucharist*, the *Anti-Type*, *Image*, and *true Figure of the Body and Blood of Christ*, whence it follows he places the Adoration of the *Eucharist* in the rank of those which terminate not themselves in the Object which we have before us, but which refer to the Original they represent, wherein the Matter or that which is visible is not adored; but where by means of a material Symbol, a man raises up his mind to the Object whose Symbol he beholds. In fine it needs only be observ'd, that if the *Greeks* adored the Sacrament with an Adoration of *Latria* terminating it self in the Sacrament, never man was more impertinent than he, in endeavouring to excuse a relative Adoration by an absolute one, never man betrayed more his Cause, for besides the Extravagancy of his reasonings, for which he may be justly reproach'd, he may be likewise told, he falls into a new Heresie, and horrible Impiety, making the Adoration of the *Eucharist* to be like that of the Cross and consecrated Vessels, or that of Images, whose visible Subject or Matter men do not adore. Neither must Mr. Arnaud tell us he speaks only of the Adoration of the Accidents, for Stephen expressly ranks this Adoration in the number of those amongst which *the visible Matter is not worshipped*, and consequently, means there is in the *Eucharist* a Substance which is not adored. He say's, *they worship these Anti-Types and kiss them*. Now in the intention of the Communicants these acts of Adoration and kissing are not barely directed to the Accidents, but to the whole Subject called the *Eucharist*. He say's, in short, *that in partaking of these Anti-Types, we obtain Sanctification*, which appertains to the whole *Eucharist*, and not the bare Accidents.

*DAMASCENE* who lived much about the same time as Stephen, and stiffly maintain'd the same Cause, thus argues. *I worship not, say's he, the Matter,*

Orat. 1. d. 1. mag.

Matter, but the Author of the Matter, who has himself become Matter for my sake, and exists in it, to the end he may give me Salvation by it, and as to the Matter by which Salvation is procured me, I will ever worship it, not as the Divinity, God forbid, for how can that be God which has been taken out of nothing, altho it be true that the Body of God is God by means of the Union of the two Natures in Unity of Person, for the Body is made without Conversion that which it hath been anointed, and remains what it was by Nature, to wit, Living Flesh, indued with a reasonable Soul and Understanding, which has had a beginning, and bin created: *AS TO THE OTHER MATTER*, by which Salvation has been obtain'd, for us, I honour and worship it, as being full of the Divine Grace. The blessed wood of the Cross, is it not Matter? The Holy and Venerable Mount Calvary, is it not Matter? The Rock of Life wherein was the Sepulchre of Jesus Christ, and which was the Spring of our Resurrection, was it not Matter? Those black letters wherewith the Holy Gospels were written, are they not Matter? This Holy Table from whence we receive the Bread of Life, is it not Matter? In fine the Body and Blood of our Lord, are they not Matter? You must either then overthrow the Veneration and Worship of all these things, or grant the Adoration of the Images of God and his Friends the Saints. It is evident that by this Body and Blood of Christ, he means the Eucharist, and distinguishes it from the Natural Body, for speaking of the Natural Body as of a Matter, he adds, *As to the other Matter, &c.* which shews he passes over to another kind of material things distinct from the Body hypostatically united to the Divinity. It is likewise apparent he ranks this Body and Blood in the same order and degree with the wood of the Cross, Mount Calvary, the Holy Sepulchre, the Letters of the Gospel, and the Communion Table, and attributes no more to all these things than one and the same Adoration, an Adoration proportionable to that of Images.

WHEN he has occasion to discourse on the Adoration which ought to be given to the Natural Body, he expresses himself after a different manner. *I adore, say's he, one God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, I give to him alone the worship of Latria, I worship one God, one Divinity, but I adore likewise the Trinity of Persons, God the Father, God the Son clothed with Humane Flesh, and God the Holy Ghost, which yet are no more than one God. I worship not the Creature besides the Creator, but I adore the Creator who hath made me, and who without the loss of his Dignity or suffering any Division has descended to me to honour my Nature and make me partaker of the Divine Nature. I do also together with my God and King adore th'enclosure of his Body, if a man may so express himself, tho not as a Vestment, or fourth Person, God forbid, but as having been declared God and made without Conversion, that which it hath been anointed.* Here the Humanity is adored in Person, with an Adoration of *Latria*, whereas the Mystical Body and Blood are only adored with a relative Adoration after the same manner as the Cross, the Holy Sepulchre and Images. *If you say, say's he, in another place a little farther, that we ought only to be joyned with God in Spirit and Understanding, abolish then all corporeal things, Tapers, Incense, Prayers uttered with an articulate voice; nay, even th. Divine Mysteries which consist of Matter, to wit, the Bread and Wine, the Oyl of Unction, the Sign of the Cross, the Reed, and Lance which pierced his Side to make Life issue out from thence. Either the veneration of all these things must be abolished, which cannot be done, or not reject the Worship of Images; What he called a little above, the Body and Blood, he here calls Bread and Wine, but whether he designs them under the name of Body and Blood, or whether he calls them Bread and Wine, he attributes no more to them than a proportionable Adoration unto*

unto that which he pretends ought to be given, Images and other material things he mentions, that is to say a relative Adoration.

*Pho. de Synod.*

WE find in *Photius* a Passage like unto those of *Stephen*, and *Damascene*, in which he justifies after the same manner, the relative Adoration given to Images, by the example of that which is given to the Mysteries. He compares these two Worships together, and makes them of the same order and quality. *When we adore*, say's he, *the Image of Jesus Christ, the Cross, and the Sign of the Cross, we do not pretend to terminate our Worship or Adoration in these things, but direct it to him, who by the unspeakable Riches of his Love became man and suffered a shameful death for us. And thus do we adore the Temples, Sepulchers, and Relicks of Saints, from whence do proceed those miraculous cures; praising and glorifying God who has given them this Power, and if there be any such like thing in our mystical and holy Sacraments, we acknowledge and glorifie the Author and first Cause of it, for the Gift and Grace which he has bestowed on us by their means.*

AND this is what I had to say on this Point; I leave now the Reader to judge, whether my denial that the *Greeks* do adore this Sacrament according to the manner of the *Latins*, be the effect of an unparallel'd rashness, as speaks Mr. *Arnaud*, or whether it be not rather the effect of a Knowledge and Consideration more just and disinterested than that of his. I ground my negative on the expresse Testimonies of *Sacranus*, *Fohn de Lasko*, *Peter Scarga*, *Anthony Cancus*, *Francis Richard*, all Roman Catholicks and Ecclesiasticks, who lived in those Places and are consequently unrepachable Witnesses in this particular, who all of 'em expressly affirm the *Greeks* do not adore the Sacrament after Consecration, and reproach them with it as a capital crime and brand them in this respect with the name of Hereticks. I confirm this not only by the Silence of Travellers who exactly relate the Ceremonies of their Office, without observing this essential particular, but likewise from the proper Rituals of the *Greeks* and their refusal to practise the chief Ceremonies the *Latins* use to expresse their Adoration, without substituting others equivalent to them. I farther confirm it by expresse Passages taken out of other Greek Fathers, who only attribute to the *Eucharist* a relative Adoration, like unto that given to Images, Temples, Croffes, and Relicks of Saints. And yet Mr. *Arnaud*, tells me, *that he is both ashamed and sorry for me, and that my negative is the effect of a rashness beyond example*, and he grounds this fierce charge on *voluntary Adorations and internal Venerations*, which no body ever saw but himself, that is to say, on *Chimera's* with which the necessity of maintaining his *Thesis*, right or wrong, has furnish'd him. Yet how greatly soever mens minds may be prejudic'd, I doubt not but good men of his own Communion will be of another mind.

*Book 10. ch. 27.  
9.*

I hope at least they will not say I have been rash in affirming the *Greeks* adore not the Sacrament as do the *Latins*. For were there any rashness in this assertion they must blame these Canons, Archbishops and Jesuits and not me, who only denied it after them. I hope likewise the Proof I have made touching these same *Greeks* not believing Transubstantiation will not be esteemed inconsiderable, my Consequence being grounded on Mr. *Arnaud's* own Principle. *Not only*, say's he, *the Doctrine of the real Presence is necessarily annexed to the internal Adoration, but also to some act of external respect. For altho they may be separated by metaphysical Suppositions or extravagant Errors,* such



*such as those of some Hereticks in these latter days, yet is it impossible to separate them by the real Suppositions of Persons endued with common sense.*

## CHAP. VIII.

*The Fourteenth Proof taken from that the Greeks when ever they argue touching the Azyme, do carry on their Disputes upon this Principle, That the Sacrament is still real Bread after its Consecration. The Fifteenth, from the little care they take to preserve the Substance of the Sacrament. The Sixteenth, from a Passage of Oecumenius.*

**W**E know very well that the *Greeks* consecrate the *Eucharist* with leaven'd Bread, and that there is touching this Point, between them and the *Latins*, so stiff a Controversie, that the *Greeks* believe their Altars are polluted when the *Latins* have perform'd their Service thereon, and therefore when ever this happens, they wash them with exceeding great care before they use them. I shall not trouble my self, or Reader, with mentioning here any thing touching the beginning or progress of this Dispute, all that I aim at here, being only to give farther light to the question I handle. It seems to me then no hard matter in reading their Books concerning this Point, to know what their real belief is touching Transubstantiation, for we find them continually arguing from this Principle, that the *Eucharist* is still Bread after Consecration:

AND this appears by the Letters of *Michael Cerularius*, and *Leo* Bishop of *Acrida*, to *John* Bishop of *Tranis* in the Kingdom of *Naples*; for giving an account of the Institution of the Holy Sacrament, they add, *observe how our Saviour has called under the New Testament the Bread his Body.* This expression let Mr. *Arnaud* say what he will, does not well agree with the belief of Transubstantiation; for according to this Doctrine it may be affirm'd; that our Saviour has made Bread his Body and changed it into his Body; but it cannot be said with good sense, that he calls the Bread his Body, seeing this latter expression signifies, he attributes to the Bread the name of his Body, which supposes the Bread remains, and receives the name of the Body of Jesus Christ. Yet do we meet with these kind of expressions not only in *Michael Cerularius*, but in the *Triode* of the *Greeks* which is one of their Ecclesiastical Books, *ὅσα δὲ, say they, having likewise related the words of the Institution ὅτι ἄρτον λέγει τὸ πᾶν αὐτὸ ἔστι μὲν ἄζυμον, αἰχυνέσθωσαν ἐν οἷ τῇ διότι ἄζυμον προσφθεγόμενες, Observe that he calls the Bread his Body and not*

*Biblioth. Patr.  
Tom. 4. f. d. 1. 4.*

*Allat de lib.  
Eccles. Grac.  
diff. 2.*

*an Azyme, let them then be ashamed that offer in the Sacrifice unleaven'd Bread.* It appears by the Dispute which bears the name of *Gennadius*, that this Passage is frequently used by the *Greeks*. And Mr *Arnaud* has observ'd that *Feremias* and *Photius* Patriarchs of *Constantinople* express themselves in this same manner, *Jesus Christ call'd the Bread his Body, the Wine his Blood*; He assures us that *Feremias* believed Transubstantiation, but whether he did or not we shall see hereafter; He likewise tell us that *Photius* joyns this expression with that which naturally denotes Transubstantiation, to wit, that the

*Gennad. p. 9  
Concil. Flor.  
cap. 2. scilicet 7.  
Book 10.*

common Bread is changed into the Body of Jesus Christ, *μεταβάλλειν*, but this is meer mockery to desire us to believe that a Term so general as is that of *μεταβάλλειν*, does naturally signifie a Conversion of Substance.

*Bibl. Patr.*

*Tom. 4. Edit. 4.*

I N the second place the *Greeks* are wont in this Controversie to reproach the *Latins* with their eating the Jewish Azyme, and that they eat it as a Figure of the Flesh of Christ, *You offer to God in Sacrifice*, say's *Nicetas Pectoratus*, the Azyme and dead Bread of the Jews, and eat it as a Figure of the true and living Flesh of Jesus Christ; and a little further, *he that makes the Azyme, and eats it, altho he has not taken this Custom from the Jews, yet does he in this imitate them, and his Knowledge is no greater than that of a Jew.* They apply to this occasion the Eleventh Canon of the Sixth Council in *Trullo*, which forbids the eating of the Azyme of the Jews, and this is near upon the same Language of all the rest of the *Greeks*. But these expressions would be extravagant did they not suppose that which we eat in the *Eucharist* to be real Bread; for to eat the Body of Jesus Christ under the Accidents of an Azyme, is not to eat the Azyme of the Jews, and in effect those amongst the *Latins* that have refuted them touching this Article have not fail'd to tell them, that after the Conversion 'tis no longer Bread, neither leaven'd nor unleaven'd, but the Body of Jesus Christ, and that in supposing this Conversion, the Question concerning the Azyme's is superfluous, as appears in an Anonymous Treatise in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, and in a Letter of Pope Gregory the 9th. which Mr. *Arnaud* mentions in the Tenth Chapter of his Third Book.

*Gennad. pro*

*Concil. Flor.*

*cap. 2. §. 1.*

I T appears likewise by a Treatise attributed to *Gennadius*, the Patriarch of *Constantinople*, that at the Council of *Florence*; wherein 'twas ordain'd the Priests shall consecrate the Body of Jesus Christ with leavened Bread, and with the Azyme, every one according to the Custom of his own Church; the *Greeks* that rejected the Union thus loudly expressed themselves, saying, *That the Council had divided the Mystery of the New Testament into two Parts, and made two Bodies of Jesus Christ, the one of unleavened, and th'other of leavened Bread.* Which Language would be very improper in the mouths of Persons who believe Transubstantiation; for besides that this would not be two Bodies, but one alone under the different Species, it should at least have been said they had set up two Bodies, one made of leaven'd th'other of unleaven'd Bread.

*Bibl. Patr.*

*Tom. 4. Edit. 4.*

W E find that the *Greeks* in this same Controversie, to shew unleavened Bread ought not to be used in this Mystery, affirm that Leaven is the same thing to Bread, as the Soul is to the Body, because Bread receives elevation by means of the Leaven, so that they call leavened Bread, living Bread, as being that which has Spirits, and on the contrary the Azyme dead Bread, a dead Lump, unfit to represent the living Body of Jesus Christ; and thereupon they ground this Accusation, that the *Latins* eat a dead Lump, inanimate Bread, and not the Body of Jesus Christ which is of the same Substance as ours, and is not void of Soul, as taught the Heretick *Apollinarinus*. We may find this kind of arguing in *Cerularius* his Letter, in that of *Nicetas Pectoratus*, and in the Answers of Cardinal *Humbert*, and likewise describ'd at large in the Anonymous Author I mention'd, *The Christians Easter*, say's he, *was celebrated, not with unleaven'd Bread, but on the contrary with that which is leaven'd; to set forth the Perfection of Jesus Christ. For our Lord has united to himself two Natures in one Person; and as the Divine Nature is most simple, so the humane Nature is composed of Soul and Body, or Flesh. There being then*

*in*

in Jesus Christ the Divinity, the Soul and the Body, so likewise in the Mystery of the Sacrament which we celebrate with compleat Bread, that is to say with leavened Bread, there are three things, namely, Flower, Leaven, and Water. But yours, far from being a true Sacrament, is no Sacrament at all, being so different from the Truth. But we find this arguing more clearly expressed in a Letter of the Patriarch of Antioch to the Bishop of Aquila: Those, say's he; that partake of the Azyme are in danger of falling into the Heresie of Apollinarius, who did not stick to affirm that the Son of God took of the Virgin Mary a Body destitute of Soul and Reason, affirming the Divinity was to him in stead of the rational Soul. The Azyme then which has neither Salt nor Leaven, is it not dead and inanimate, and worthy in effect of Death? Our Lord Jesus Christ who is perfect God and Man has two Natures, and one only Hypostasis, having taken of the Holy Virgin a living Body indued with Understanding, and given us the Mystery of the New Testament by means of perfect Bread. Supposing the Bread of the Eucharist to be a Mystery that represents Jesus Christ, its Substance still existing, it will then be no hard matter to comprehend this reasoning of the Greeks; for they mean, that the lump of Bread represents the Body of Christ, the Leaven his Soul, or Life, and the Salt his Understanding, or Reason, wherefore they say, that the Leaven stands for the Soul, and the Salt for the Understanding: So that partaking of this Bread, we mystically eat the animate and living Body of Jesus Christ, such as it is in effect, and not such a one as Apollinarius dreamt of. Whereas those that partake of an Azyme, do only mystically eat inanimate Flesh. But suppose, these People believed Transubstantiation, and judge then of their meaning. They that celebrate the Eucharist, say they, with unleavened Bread eat a dead Lump, how so? They eat not the Substance of the Azyme, but that of the living Flesh of Jesus Christ. They offer, say they, Flesh that is dead. How so again, if they offer'd it in its proper Substance such as it now is, that is to say living? They eat not the Body of Jesus Christ which is consubstantial with us, because they eat an inanimate Azyme. But it is false that they eat the Azyme, they receive only the colours and appearances of it, in the same manner as others take the colours and appearances of leaven'd Bread. Their Sacrament is not indeed a Sacrament, differing so greatly from the Truth. Their Sacrament being the Truth it self, it can admit of neither difference nor resemblance. Who sees not these People are unintelligible if we imagine they argue from the Principle of Transubstantiation? For if they only mean, that the matter of the Sacrament must be leaven'd Bread to become proper to be changed into the real Body of Jesus Christ, they must consider it in the time preceding the Consecration; as for instance, were I to shew that these Stones are not proper to build a Pallace, I must consider them in the time preceding the Building. Common sence leads us to this. But these People on the contrary are wont almost always to consider it in the time which follows the Consecration. You partake, say's Nicetas, of an inanimate Azyme, you offer to God an Azyme, being the dead Bread of the Jews; You are fed from the Hebrews Table, and not from the living and rational Table of the Lord. You communicate with the Jews, say's Cerularius, you eat a dead Lump, say's the Author of the Treatise of the Azymes against the Armenians, you receive an Azyme, you offer an Azyme, being dead Flesh, whereas Jesus Christ has given his Mystery, διὰ τῆς τοῦ αἵματος, with perfect Bread. All this does very ill accord with the Belief of Transubstantiation.

Auſar. Com-  
beſis, Tom 2. in  
not. ad Iſaaci  
arm. Cath. am-  
bas m.

Auſar. Com-  
beſ. Tom. 2. in  
not ad Iſ. Ara-  
men, in.

NEITHER will it be less difficult to reconcile it with some other expressions used by the Greeks in this same Controversie, as with that of Nice-



*Nicot. pect. in* tas, which I already mention'd; You offer in Sacrifice to God the *Azyme*, the  
*Lat. Bib. Patr.* dead or unleavened Bread of the Jews, which you eat as a Figure of the true and  
 4.4. living Flesh of our Lord; and that which he adds soon after. You say that  
 the Apostles receiv'd the *Azymes* of Jesus Christ, and that they left 'em to you;  
 for the celebrating of the Mystery as a representation of the Body of Jesus Christ,  
 And that of *Fohn Citrius* which I already likewise mention'd, We offer in  
 Sacrifice leavened Bread for the Body of our Lord, *ἀντὶ τοῦ ζυμωτοῦ σφραγιστοῦ*.

*Apud. Allat.*  
*Perpet. Cons.*  
*Lih. 3. cap. 12.*  
*Sigisim. Reg.*  
*Mose. Com.*

And that of the Patriarch of *Antioch*, the Leaven stands for the Soul, and the  
 Salt for the Understanding. And that of *Fohn* the Metropolitan of *Russia* in his  
 Letter to the Pope, or rather to the Archbishop of *Rome*, as he calls him, *Fesus*  
*Christ* gave not to his Disciples an *Azyme*, but Bread when he said, Behold the  
 Bread which I give you. Let Mr. *Arnaud* pretend what he will, yet I really be-  
 lieve these expressions do not well please him. He may tell us the *Eucharist*  
 may be consider'd in two different respects; and that when 'tis looked upon in  
 reference to its external Vail, 'tis called a Figure and Bread, and yet the Do-  
 ctrine of Transubstantiation receive no prejudice thereby. But this will not  
 satisfie the World, for 'tis plainly apparent, the sence of *Nicetas* and other Au-  
 thors reaches farther than this; for to say, we offer dead Bread, unleavened  
 Bread, and figuratively eat it as the Flesh of Jesus Christ, that our Saviour gave  
 Bread to his Disciples, that he told them 'twas Bread he gave them, that this  
 Bread, should signifie his Body, the Leaven his Soul, and the Salt his Understand-  
 ing, this is not a bare consideration of simple Accidents. But 'tis on the contra-  
 ry to suppose, that the Bread remains, for we can neither offer, nor eat, dead  
 Bread, a dead Lump, unleavened Bread, the figurative Bread of the Flesh of  
 Jesus Christ, if it does not remain Bread in its real Substance. The Bread can  
 neither stand for the Body, nor the Leaven for the Soul, nor the Salt for the  
 Understanding, if in effect this Bread, this Leaven and Salt do not any longer  
 subsist, but give place to the Body, Soul, and Understanding of Jesus Christ.  
 Mr. *Arnaud*, may tell us, if he pleases, that *Agapius* his Monk of Mount *Athos*,  
 who taught Transubstantiation makes use of this way of speaking, that the  
*Eucharist* is to us in the stead of Jesus Christ, wee shall find he is a Person that  
 would not wholly estrange himself from the expressions of the *Greeks*, if it  
 be true that he received the Doctrine of the *Latins*. But we must go on  
 with our proofs.

O U R Fifteenth Proof, shall be drawn from the little care the *Greeks* take  
 to preserve the Substance of the Sacrament after its Consecration. For it is  
 not to be imagin'd supposing their Belief to be the same with that of the  
 Church of *Rome*, they would be so neglectful of it, and disrespectful to it as  
 they are. I have already related in my Answer to the *Perpetuity* what Car-  
 dinal *Humbert* wrote from *Constantinople*, touching their Custom of burying  
 under Ground the remains of the Communion, and letting fall the Crums  
 thereof, without troubling themselves about them. When you break, say's  
 he, the Holy Bread, or receive it, you are not concerned at the Crums falling down  
 on the Ground. Neither are you more careful when you wipe the Dishes after an  
 undecent manner, with the Leaves of Palm-trees, or Brushbes made with Hogs-  
 bristles. Some among you gather up the Body of Christ with so great irreve-  
 rence that you fill boxes with it, and to prevent the scattering of the Crums,  
 press them down with your hands. They eat likewise what is left of the Oblation  
 after the same manner as common Bread, and sometimes so much of it, till they  
 glut themselves with it, and what they cannot eat they bury under Ground, or throw  
 it into Wells. He in another place severely censures the Custom of the  
*Greeks*; To bury, say's he, the *Eucharist*, as some are said to do, or put it in  
 Bottles;

*Humbert con-*  
*tr. Nic. Bib.*  
*Patr. Tom. 4.*  
*Edit. 4.*

Bottles, or scatter it about, is certainly a great neglect, and sign, that such have not the fear of God before their eyes. For the Holy and Divine Mysteries are the Faith of Christians. And in another place, in answer to Cerularius, who boasted that he would teach great and excellent things, are these, say's he, those great and excellent things you speak of, to place the Oblation on the Altar in so great a quantity, that neither the Ministers nor People, can devour it, but you must bury it, or throw it into Wells made for that purpose?

Humbert contr. Græc. Cæcumen.

Ilid.

THE Anonymous Author of the Treatise against the Greeks observes the same thing with Humbert, At Easter, say's he, when the People receive the Communion, they provide abundance of Bread, and consecrate it all; and because the heaps which are left, cannot be kept, they bury them.

Bibl. Patr. Tom. 4 Edit. 4.

THIS Custom of burying the Eucharist remains still amongst the Greeks; for the Jesuit Richard relates, that a poor Woman of the Isle of Saint Erinis, had no sooner received the Holy Communion, but she brought it up again by reason of the weakness of her stomach, and that the Greek Priest, who gave it her before he confessed her, did not scruple to take up what she had vomited and bury it, together with the Sacred Particles at the foot of his Altar, for which fact he was blam'd by the other Papa's, who would have him bury it on the Sea shore, judge then, adds he, how great is the ignorance of these Greek Priests, and how great our Saviour's patience to bear this? He undoubtedly saw all these disorders and indignities he was to suffer, when he instituted this Divine Sacrament.

Relation of the Isle of St. Erin. chap. 17. p. 260.

THE same Author, say's likewise, That their Priests following the Custom of the Jews, let their Beards grow, which are all over wet with the Lord's Blood when they drink. Arcudius reproaches them in the same manner. The Greek Priests, say's he, receive the Eucharist very undecently, for taking the consecrated Bread they grasp it close in their hands, and so lift it up on their heads, (I suppose they do this as a sign of Honour and Veneration) and having eaten the Eucharist, and recited some Praises, they lift up their hands to their heads and stroke them, for it commonly happens that some Crums stick thereon. As soon as they have drank the Blood, they do not scruple to wipe their Beards with their hands, or handkerchiefs, as if they had drank common Wine; and forasmuch as they let their Beards grow, and never cut their Moustaches, it frequently happens that drops of Blood fall from them on the Holy Vestments, or Altar, and not seldom on the Ground. He farther adds, That the Rubrick of their Liturgy deceives them, and that these words should be corrected, after the Priest has wiped his lips and the brims of the Sacred Chalice, with the Veyl he has in his hands, he calls the Deacon. Sacranus speaking of the Russians, say's likewise, That they give the Communion to the People in nasty wooden Spoons, and wipe off the Crums which stick thereon with a cloth, letting them fall on the Ground.

Tract. contr. Bibl. Patr. Tom. 4. Arcud. lib. 3. cap. 60.

THEY are far from being scrupulous, and taking that care the Roman Church does, to prevent the Eucharists being eaten by Vermin, for the Rats may run away with great pieces of it, and yet they not concerned thereat. Manuel the Patriarch of Constantinople (whom Binius ranks in the Seventh Century) being askt by one of his Bishops what punishment he thought a Priest deserv'd, who let a Mouse run away with the consecrated Bread, coldly answered, That those to whom these mischances happen are not to be blamed, because these things are usual; Multa enim ejusmodi sæpe accidunt. If the like Questions were offer'd to a Latin Bishop, 'tis not to be doubted but he would insist on the care that ought to be taken for the prevention of these inconveniencies,

inconveniencies, and instead of slighting the matter and excusing the Priest, as this Patriarch does, by saying this often happens, he would on the contrary invent all ways imaginable to prevent this from ever hap'ning.

LET Mr. *Arnaud* if he pleases reflect a little on all these things. How is it possible these People would shew so little reverence and so great neglect to the Substance of the Sacrament, did they believe it to be the proper Substance of their Saviour? They eat thereof as common Bread till they have glutted themselves, they bury it, and cast it into Wells, and when any Crums thereof fall to the Ground, or stick on their hair, they are not all concerned thereat. They spill the consecrated Wine on their Beards, on the Altar, yea on the Ground, and matter it not, and their Liturgy enjoyns them to wipe their lips with their handkerchers when they have received the Communion, to which we may add what I related in the foregoing Chapter, that they let the Sacrament hang a whole year in a linnen bag on a nail, exposed to the mercy of worms, according to the express testimony of *Sacranus*, and the Archbishop of *Gnesne*. Now what congruity has all this with the belief of Transubstantiation? Mr. *Arnaud* may distinguish, if he pleases, between the necessary Consequences, and those of congruity, yet all his Philosophy falls short of perswading us that these practices are consistent with the belief, that 'tis no longer the Substance of Bread, but the proper Substance of the Body and Blood of Christ.

I shall finish this Chapter with a passage taken out of *Oecumenius*, which shall be my Seventeenth Proof. This Author (who is famous amongst the Greeks and lived in the Eleventh Century) expounding these words of Saint Peter, *Let your Conversation be honest among the Gentiles, that whereas they speak ill of you as of evil doers, they may glorifie God*; Saint Peter, say's he, *speaks here of the false Accusations of the Heathens, and if you would know the particulars thereof, read what Ireneus Bishop of Lyons has written touching the Martyrs Sanctus, and Blandina, and you will be perfectly informed. This in few words is an account thereof. The Greeks having taken some Slaves belonging to the Christian Catechumenists, used great violence towards them to make them confess the Christians Mysteries, and the Slaves not knowing what to say to please those that so rudely handled them, remembered they heard their Masters relate that the Holy Communion was the Body and Blood of Christ, imagining that 'twas, in effect Flesh and Blood. Whereupon they taking this as if the Christians were wont REALLY to eat and drink human Flesh and Blood made report hereof to all the other Greeks, and by torments forced the Martyrs, Sanctus, and Blandina to confess it. But Blandina afterwards very pertinently demanded of them, how they could imagine People who out of Devotion did abstain from eating Flesh (whose use was permitted them,) should do any such thing.*

THIS passage may be considered in two respects, either as being of St. *Ireneus* or *Oecumenius*. I know very well there are several Learned men that believe *Oecumenius* was mistaken in relating this Story as if it came from Saint *Ireneus*, and in effect, we do not thus find it in the Letter of the Churches of *Vienna* and *Lyons* produced by *Eusebins*. But in the second respect, under which I now offer it, we may certainly conclude that 'twas the Sentiment of *Oecumenius* himself. For how can we suppose he would call the belief of the Slaves and Heathenish Inquisitors a mistake, *That the Holy Communion did in effect consist of Flesh and Blood, and that the Christians did really do this.* Wherefore would he reckon this Errour amongst the Slanders of the



the Heathens? Wherefore should he introduce *Blandina* refuting this Imagination had he himself believed the Communion to be *in effect and reality* the Flesh and Blood of Christ in its proper Substance, and had this been the real Sentiment of his Church? How came it to pass, he did not endeavour to mollifie and explain these Terms, and show that *Blandina* was mistaken in denying the *Eucharist* to be *in effect and reality* Flesh and Blood, or that what she did in this case was only to conceal from the Heathens, the Churches Belief in this particular, or in fine that she only denied it in one sense, to wit, that it was visibly and sensibly Flesh and Blood? How happened it, he feared not lest the *Greeks* amongst whom he lived when he gave this account would not be scandaliz'd at it, or the weak take hence occasion to call in question the truth of the Doctrines of Transubstantiation and the real Presence? Yet does he not trouble himself in searching after mollifying Terms or Explanations, and the manner in which he has laid this down does clearly shew us that he did not in any sort believe the Holy Communion to be really and in effect the Body and Blood of Christ, nor imagin'd, he affirm'd any thing contrary to the Doctrine of his Church, or which might be taken in an ill sense.

## CHAP. IX.

*The Seventeenth Proof taken from the Dispute agitated amongst the Greeks in the Twelfth Century touching the Eucharist, some of 'em affirming the Body of Jesus Christ to be incorruptible, and others corruptible. The Eighteenth, from a Passage out of Zonarus a Greek Monk that lived in the Twelfth Century.*

**I** Mention'd in my Answer to the *Perpetuity* a Dispute which arose amongst the *Greeks* in the Twelfth Century, touching the Body of Jesus Christ which we receive in the *Eucharist*, from whence I took occasion to prove the *Greeks* do not believe the Transubstantiation of the *Latins*. Mr. *Arnaud* contents not himself with pretending my Proof is not good, but will needs draw a contrary Conclusion from the same Principle I made use of. It then lies upon me to examine in this Chapter two Passages, the one of *Nicetas Choniatus*, and th'other of *Zonarus* who both take notice of this Controverſie; and to know whether this difference do's suppose Transubstantiation or not.

I will begin with *Nicetas*, who lays down the Question in these Terms. *The Question*, say's he, *was whether the Sacred Body of Jesus Christ which we receive, be incorruptible, such as it has been since his Passion and Resurrection, or corruptible as it was before his Passion.* Before we go any further, we should consider whether 'tis likely such a Question should be stated in a Church that believes Transubstantiation. This is a Point easily decided if we consider, that those that hold this Doctrine do not reckon the Body of Jesus Christ in the *Eucharist* to be either in a corruptible state; such as it was before his Passion, or an incorruptible one, wherein it has been since his Resurrection. They have invented a Third, which holds the middle between the two others, and which

*Nicetas Chron.  
Annal. lib. 3.*

which equally agrees with the two times, before and after his Resurrection, which is that they call the Sacramental State, in which they will needs have this Body to lie hid under the Accidents of Bread, being invisible and insensible in it self, without Extension, Action, or Motion, having all its Parts in one Point, and existing after the manner of Spirits. In this State according to them he has neither the incorruption he obtained by his Resurrection, nor the Corruption he put on in coming into the World, but is corruptible in respect of the Species which enclose him, and incorruptible by reason of that Spirituality which Transubstantiation gives him. How can Mr. *Arnaud* imagine that in this Principle of the Sacramental State, there may be formed the Question, whether he is incorruptible, such as he has been since his Resurrection, or corruptible as before his Passion? How can he conceive that Persons who have his third State in view, and are agreed amongst themselves, can fall into a debate touching the two others? For it cannot be supposed the ignorance of the *Greeks* has bin so great as not to let them see the inconsistency there is between their Question and the Doctrine of the Substantial Conversion, as it is taught by the *Latins*. No People can be so ignorant as not to know that a humane Body, such as is that of our Saviour; being under the Accidents of the Eucharistical Bread, is neither the same that was on the Cross, nor that which *Thomas* touched when it was risen: and we must necessarily suppose that he has neither the corruptibility under which he was before his death, nor the incorruptibility he received when he arose from the Sepulchre, but another incorruptibility, which comes to him from his existence after the manner of a Spirit. They could not be so ignorant as not to know that our Saviour celebrated his Sacrament before his death, and that we celebrate it likewise since his Ascension into Heaven, and that consequently according to the Hypothesis of Transubstantiation we cannot regulate the State of his Body in the Mystery, neither by one nor th'other of these two times, that is to say, neither by the time which preceded his death nor that which followed his Resurrection, but we must take a middle time which may agree both with the one and the other, whence it plainly appears these People believed not Transubstantiation, for had they believed it, this difference had never arose among them; and so much concerning the Question in general. Let us see now in what manner the two Parties maintained their Opinions.

*SOME*, say's *Nicetas*, asserted that it was incorruptible, because that the Participation of the Divine Mysteries is an acknowledgment, and commemoration that our Lord died and rose again for us, (as teaches the great Divine *Cyrillus*) so that whatsoever part we receive, we receive intirely that which *Thomas* handled, and that he is as it were eaten after his Resurrection, according to these following words of Saint *Chrysostom*. O wonderful! he that sits at the right hand of the Father, is found in the hands of sinners; and in another place, *Jesus Christ* is a fruit which budded in the Law, ripened in the Prophets, and was eaten after its Resurrection, and he tells us afterwards, this is no other Body than that which was too strong for death, and which began our Life. For as a little Leaven leavens the whole Lump according to the saying of the Apostle, so likewise this Body which God has made immortal, being in our Body changes and converts it wholly into it self; some likewise alledged these words of *Eutychius* that great light of the Church, we receive the Sacred Body of the Lord intirely and his precious Blood after the same manner, although we receive but one part of it, for it is divided indivisibly into all by reason of the mixture.

*MR. Arnaud* pretends this Party supposed Transubstantiation, because, say's

say's he, they asserted after St. Chrysostom, that our Saviour was in Heaven Lib. 2. cap 14. and on Earth, and after Eutychus that he was distributed wholly and intirely to all, pag 242. that is to say, they taught the real Presence. But I hope he will correct his, that is to say, when he has considered that the Design of these Disputants was only to shew in what respect Jesus Christ communicates himself to us in the Eucharist, to wit, not as being mortal and corruptible, such as he was before his Passion, but as being risen. So that when they say we receive him whom Thomas handled, him who sitteth at the right hand of the Father, the same that vanquish'd death, the Body which God made immortal, they do not design thereby to signifie his Substance, but only the State which followed his Resurrection, as if they had said, we do not so much receive that Body, which the Souldiers misused, as that which Thomas handled; not so much in respect that it was on Earth, but at the right hand of the Father, not so much for that it has suffered death, but vanquished it, and that God has made it immortal, which is to say, in a word, that we receive him as risen, because that in this Quality he is the Principle of our Life. It is clear that this was their drift, whence there can be nothing concluded in reference to the Substance, for when we receive the Body of Jesus Christ, not in Substance, but in Mystry, yet do we receive it in respect of its being risen; and receive him also intire, and so that passage of Eutychus will not decide our difference.

T H E R E need other considerations for this.

A N D first it must be remembred that those that will argue from the Hypothesis of Transubstantiation, that the Body of Jesus Christ is incorruptible in the Eucharist, must not attribute to it the incorruptibleness which comes to it from the State of his Glory, for besides that it could not have it, as I already said, at the time of the first Supper, seeing that our Saviour was not then glorifi'd, it is moreover apparent that even at this day, it is not in this State of Glory and Majesty which it has in Heaven. They must then attribute to it this other incorruption, which is the effect of its Sacramental State. And 'tis unto this that the Doctrine of the substantial Presence does naturally and necessarily drive them. It is therein incorruptible, because 'tis indivisible and insensible after the manner of Spirits.

Y E T do not the Greeks mention one word tending to this sacramental incorruption, they speak absolutely only concerning the incorruption which follows his Resurrection and Glorification, which is an evident token they argued not from the Principle of Transubstantiation. Secondly, had these Greeks intended to propose our Saviour's Resurrection; wherefore say they, that the Mysteries are a commemoration of it as well as of his death? for they might with greater strength and clearness of reason affirm, that seeing 'tis the proper Substance of the Body that is risen, it can be no more either passible or corruptible, as it was before the Resurrection. How comes it then to pass they mention not a word of that which reason would suggest to them, supposing they believed the Conversion of Substances?

Y E T Mr. Arnaud tells us their reasoning was good, and that it overthrew Lib. 3. cap 14. the whole Foundation of those Hereticks, which was, that the Eucharist only represented our Saviour Christ in a State of Death, whence they concluded he was in it only in a State of Death, in taking for their Principle that he was therein such, as he is represented. But Mr. Arnaud does not consider, that besides it is not true that the Adversaries of these Greeks did take for their Principle that the



Body was in it, such as 'tis therein represented, in supposing it was really in it; I say this would be moreover to impute to these *Greeks*, not a reason, but an overthrowing of all reason and common sense. If we believe Mr. *Arnaud* their Adversaries must have reasoned in this manner. Jesus Christ is in the *Eucharist*, such as he is therein represented; now he is therein represented, in a State of Death, he is then therein effectually dead. Supposing they believed Transubstantiation, were they not very imprudent to let slip this first Proposition, which is altogether contrary to Transubstantiation in the sense Mr. *Arnaud* would have them hold it, to apply themselves to the second, which is undeniably evident. For no body ever denied, that our Saviour is represented in the *Eucharist* in a State of Death, seeing this Sacrament is a commemoration of his Death. But those that hold the Transubstantiation of the Bread into the living and glorified Body of Jesus Christ, may not grant that he is really in it such as he is represented, because he must be effectually dead, being represented therein as dead, which is punctually what the Adversaries of these *Greeks* would conclude. They had been then very imprudent to pass by the first Proposition of their Adversaries Argument, on which they might defend themselves and apply themselves to the second, against which there could be nothing said. For as I already observed, it cannot be denied but that our Saviour is represented in the *Eucharist* in a State of Death. But would they not likewise have been very impertinent to apply themselves to the second Proposition (in asserting as they have done) that our Saviour is represented in the *Eucharist* in a State of Death and Resurrection both together? What is this but to conclude, that he is then in it at the same time actually dead, and actually risen by this Principle acknowledged by both Parties, *that he is really in it such as he is therein represented.* The Catholics, say's Mr. *Arnaud*, overthrew the Foundation of the Hereticks, by a Passage of Saint Cyril's, in which this holy man affirms that the *Eucharist* is the Confession of Jesus Christ dead and risen for us. Whence they rightly concluded that he was then in it in a State of Resurrection, and consequently in an incorruptible State. If this Conclusion be good, as Mr. *Arnaud* say's it is, this is so too; he is then in it in a State of Death, and consequently in a State of Corruption, for *Cyrillus* does as well assert that 'tis the Confession of Jesus Christ dead, as risen; whence it follows that according to these People our Saviour dies and rises again effectually in the *Eucharist*. And thus do they argue according to Mr. *Arnaud*, Our Saviour is in the *Eucharist*, such as he is therein represented, now he is represented therein, not only in a State of Death but Resurrection. He is then really in it not only dead, but likewise risen again, and consequently corruptible and incorruptible both together. This would be the most sottish reasoning imaginable, for after this manner they would as well argue for their Adversaries as themselves. And yet this is the arguing which Mr. *Arnaud* so commends. And into these absurdities and extravagancies does he lead those Persons he would have favourable to him.

YET he adds, *That 'tis an easie matter to conclude that according to these Catholics, Jesus Christ was really present in the Eucharist, but 'tis a hard matter to divine by what means Mr. Claude has concluded he was not in it.* It is no such difficult matter to know this. For if these People said not what common sense immediately dictated to them, supposing they believed Transubstantiation, but on the contrary that which even common sense would hinder them from saying, it follows they had not this Hypothesis in their Minds. Now this is what my Proof contains, for it shews that what they said would be

be an extravagancy, and likewise what they ought to say, and have not said. For they ought to say that our Saviour since his Resurrection can be no longer in a State of Death, or passibility, and consequently that being really in the *Eucharist*, he cannot be therein corruptible, and this they have not said.

*BUT* how, (say's Mr. Arnaud,) can Mr. Claude know what they have said, or not said? Will he pretend that all the reasonings of these Persons are contain'd in the short account this Historian gives us of this Debate. But I do not pretend to this, for I only say, that if the Greeks whose Dispute is set down by *Nicetas*, believed Transubstantiation, he would have made them reason after another manner than they do, he would have made them say what sense and reason do readily suggest to People that hold this Doctrine, and not Impertinencies, which could never enter into the mind of a man prepossessed with Transubstantiation.

*BUT*, adds he, these Greeks have expressly said, what Mr. Claude blames them for not saying. For have they not expressed this clearly in these Words, that whatsoever part we receive of the *Eucharist*, we receive intirely Jesus Christ himself whom Thomas handled, because we eat him after his Resurrection, which they confirmed by divers Passages of the Fathers, and amongst the rest by that of *St. Chrysostom*; O wonderful! He that sits at the right hand of the Father is found in the hands of sinners. I answer that Mr. Arnaud comprehends not the force of an Objection but only when he pleases. I do not deny but that these Greeks said, That Jesus Christ is in the *Eucharist* as risen, and that we receive him wholly and intire. This is the State of their Question, and they prove it by Passages taken out of the Fathers. But I say that had they reasoned on the Hypothesis of the substantial Conversion, they would have said that Jesus Christ since his Resurrection can be no longer either mortal or passible in himself, that he exists on the Altar after the manner of a Spirit, and is consequently incorruptible; that the substantial Conversion cannot be made in the dead and inanimate Body of Jesus Christ, forasmuch as this is a State which has ceased since so many Ages, and that it would be blasphemy and horrid cruelty against the Majesty of the Son of God to make him die every day really and personally. And this is what I said in plain Terms, but Mr. Arnaud would not understand me. I tell him therefore again, that common sense led the Greeks to this, had their belief been the same as the *Latins*. Yet you cannot find this in what *Nicetas* makes them speak. You read indeed that whatsoever part we receive, we partake of him whom Thomas handled, that is to say, of Jesus Christ; the word *Same* which Mr. Arnaud has added, is of his own invention. You find there that he is eaten after his Resurrection, and instead of Mr. Arnaud's *Because*, there is in the Greek a Diminutive Particle *ὡς ἐσθίου*, he is as it were eaten, but you find not that Jesus Christ can be any more passible, nor that he is in the *Eucharist* after the manner of a Spirit, nor what a great outrage it would be to the Son of God to make him die and suffer personally again. And yet this is what ought to be said according to sense and reason, supposing they believed the real Presence, and design'd to refute their Adversaries.

*NICETAS* continuing to relate as from the part of these Greeks the Passage of *Euthychius*, adds these words, It is as a Seal which imprints its form on the matters which receive it, and which yet remain one, after this Communication, without being diminished or changed into those things which receive the Impression, altho several in number. Even as one voice alone uttered by a

Person, and cast forth into the Air, remains wholly intire in him that utters it, and yet is carried wholly intire in the Air to the ears of them which hear it, without any of the hearers receiving more or less, but it remains indivisible and wholly intire in all, when they should be several thousands in number, altho it be but one Body, for a voice is nothing else but verberated Air. Let no one then doubt but that after the Holy Sacrifice and Resurrection of the incorruptible and immortal Body of our Lord, and his holy and living Blood are applied to the Anti-Types by their Consecration, but that they do I say as much imprint his proper virtue, as the things I offered by way of example do, and that he fully and intirely exists in them. I know not what Mr. Arnaud thinks of these words, but certainly he ought not to suppress them as he has done. He mentions what precedes, and follows them, but leaves out those that are in the middle. 'Tis probable he could not well brook this comparison of the Seal that imprints its Image on several things, nor that of the voice which multiplies it self in the Air, without losing its Unity, for in effect there happens no change of Substance neither in the Matter that receives impression, nor in the Air which receives the voice, and these several Matters to which the Seal communicates its Image, or those several parts of the Air into which the voice is carried are one and the same thing amongst themselves, and with the Seal, or the first Air, in respect of the Characters, or Articulation, but not at all in respect of the Substance; whence we may conclude the same thing concerning the parts of the Sacrament, which is to say, that the Bread altho it receives the impression of the virtue of Christ's Body, yet does it keep its Substance, after the same manner as the Body of Jesus Christ retains his, the virtue remaining the same in all the parts of the Bread. 'Tis probable he did not like, that in proposing the comparison of the Seal, *Eutychius* has observ'd, that 'tis not changed into the things to which it communicates its Characters, whence it follows, that they are not likewise changed substantially into him. 'Tis likely he could not well relish this expression, that the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ are applied to the Anti-Types, and that they imprint no less in them their proper virtues *οὐδεὶς δυνάμεις*, than the Seal does in things, and the voice which a man utters in the Air. In effect I am much mistaken if this does not represent the Idea of a Body of Jesus Christ, in virtue and efficacy against which Mr. Arnaud has so great an aversion. I am greatly deceived if these expressions be not inconsistent with the Doctrine of Transubstantiation or the real Presence. For what mean this Body and Blood applied to the Anti-Types by Consecration, and which as a Seal imprint on them their proper virtues, if we suppose these Anti-Types to be really changed into this Body and Blood, and become the same numerical Substance? But be it as it will, Mr. Arnaud ought not to retrench all this Discourse from the midst of the rest, or if he design'd to do it, not to reproach me, for that in my Answer to the *Perpetuity*, I did not mention at large the Passages of *Nicetas* and *Zonarus*. I can easilier justify my self concerning this particular than he can himself, for it will appear at the end of this Chapter, that 'twould have been very advantageous to me to represent them at their full length, and the reason why I did it not, was because I was unwilling to tire the Reader with Passages which are very long, and the sum of which may be represented in few words; besides I have caused them to be printed at large in the Margent of the last Edition of my Book. We must then attribute this reproach Mr. Arnaud makes me, to his humour and not to his Judgment, for had he taken time to consider, he would have spared us the reading of so frivolous a matter. But when we call to mind that he himself has suppressed one part of *Eutychius* his Discourse, this must be said to be an effect of his Judgment and



and not of his humour, for he seems to be naturally an Enemy to Comedians.

IN fine *Nicetas*, having made the *Greeks* of the first party speak their sense, he introduces the other, and adds these following words; *Which things being alledged by these, and they producing several other Testimonies of the Church, the others replied on the contrary, That the Mystery is not an acknowledgment of the Resurrection, but only a Sacrifice, and consequently is corruptible, being without Soul or Understanding, and that the Communicant does not receive Jesus Christ intire, but in part. For were it, say they, incorruptible, it would be indued with Spirit, it would be alive, it could neither be touched, seen, nor chewed with the Teeth, and in its cutting it would be insensible of pain.*

TO know whether these People believed Transubstantiation, or the real Presence, we need only inquire whether they had common sense, for unless they were deprived of it, they could never believe that the Substance of the Bread is changed into the dead and inanimate Body of our Lord, which is seen, handled, cut, and chewed with the teeth, and which altho inanimate, yet is grieved and pain'd to see it self thus used. If Mr. *Arnaud* can make us believe this he may make us believe any thing. How apparently impious and contradictory would this their Opinion be to expose our Saviour again to grief and pain; to imagine they see him and chew him with their teeth, and cut his flesh in pieces, that every one may partake thereof; to believe he is without Life and Soul *ἀνσθεν καὶ ἀψυχον*, and yet that he is pained and grieved, *δυσχεραίνων καὶ ὀδυρόμενος*.

BUT It will be perhaps then demanded what is their sense, seeing Mr. *Arnaud* assures us, That all this would be ridiculous, if we understand it as meant of Bread, which is only the Figure of our Saviour, and which contains only his virtue. I answer, 'tis no hard matter to give their words a national sense in supposing they only believe a change of Mystery and Virtue, for they mean that we receive Jesus Christ in the *Eucharist*, as dead and sacrific'd for us, and that for to thus represent him the Symbols are taken from the number of those things which have neither Life nor Understanding, from amongst those things (I say) which we see, handle and chew with our teeth, and which relate to the first visible State of Jesus Christ, when he lived on Earth, and was subject to pain and misery; whereas were he represented in it in his incorruptible State, wherein he is no more visible to our eyes, nor liable to the ill usages of his Enemies, our Lord would without doubt employ other Symbols, wherein these dolours are not so lively represented. And as to what they say concerning our not receiving Jesus Christ wholly entire, but in part, this supposes nothing else but that they believe the whole Body of the Bread receiving the impression of our Saviour's virtue becomes his whole Body, and that each Particle is in effect but one part of it. 'Tis probable likewise they had regard to the moral Body of our Saviour which is the Church, and is represented by Bread, of which every one takes a part, to signify that every particular Believer is not the whole Body, but one part thereof in communion with the rest, according to that of Saint Paul, *For we being many are one Bread and one Body; for we are all partakers of* 1 Cor. 10: 17 *that one Bread.*

SO that here's the Passage of *Nicetas* examin'd, and to the end it may not be thought the sense I give it is only grounded on meer conjectures, we shall

Pag. 237.

shall see immediately that *Zonarus* expresses himself to the same effect, and that these two Authors explain one another. And this is the reason Why I differ'd in this particular from Mr. *Aubertin*, when he thought *Nicetas* did not faithfully relate the Question, and that in effect the Dispute was grounded on Transubstantiation, and the real Presence. This was his conjecture, and we all know that the meer conjectures of Authors, altho otherwise never so judicious, lay not any necessity upon us of following them. Every man is at liberty in these kinds of matters, and Mr. *Arnaud* who scruples not to deviate sometimes from the Opinions of his own Doctors in Points of greater importance, had little reason to say, *That here I am at variance with my Master Aubertin*. I do in truth profess my self a Disciple to those that preceded me, for I am not of an aspiring humour, neither have I as yet been accused of affecting Singularity, but when Masters offer their conjectures under the title of *widetur*, touching an Historical Passage, as Mr. *Aubertin* has done, the Disciples have right to judge of it and reject it, if their conjectures be not well grounded. Which is what I have done in this particular, and Mr. *Arnaud* must not pretend to refute me by opposing Mr. *Aubertin* against me, much less in quoting some pretended Marginal Notes of *Wolphius*, which appear not in his *Nicetas*, Printed at *Basil*, 1557.

Tom. 6. Cyrill.  
Alex. in notis  
Vulcan. ad lib.  
advers. antrop.  
Altit. advers.  
Christi.

I come now to the other Passage which I said belong'd to *Zonarus*, and which *Alatius* attributes to *Glycas*, *We know*, say's he, dear Brother, that some suffering themselves to be too much led away by their own reasonings, do raise doubts concerning the nature of the immaculate Mysteries, sometimes maintaining the Eucharist to be incorruptible, seeing it communicates to us the life immortal, and othertimes affirming it is corruptible, because we chew it with the teeth and eat it. They assert likewise several other things according to their own fancy, and as it were, making a sport and jest of these serious things. But as for your part, dear Brother, follow not their example, trouble not your self with examining the Mysteries; lest that curiously enquiring whether the Holy Communion be above corruption, or whether it lasts but for a time, in trusting too much to your self you exceed the bounds of Truth. For these kind of things are to be believed, not questioned. And let not your reason make you so much a Sceptick as not to reject one of these Opinions as impious, and hold the other. For in examining them you will find they may be both maintain'd in a Catholick sense. The Bread of the Prothesis, is that very Flesh of our Saviour that was crucifi'd at the time of his Passion, and laid in the Sepulchre. Which manifestly appears by what our Lord said to his Apostles when he instituted the Mysteries of the New Testament; for in giving 'em to them, he said, take eat, this is my Body which is broken for you for the remission of sins. Consider, that if the Flesh of our Lord had not been corruptible it would not have been subject to the corruption of Death. For that which is incorruptible, is above all corruption. The Bread then of the Prothesis is subject to corruption, as being the real Flesh of Jesus Christ, which is cut, and chewed with the teeth, for were it incorruptible it could be neither cut nor eaten; moreover be not troubled at this saying, nor think it hard and insupportable, for although we speak to you of corruption in this divine and dreadful Communion, yet is it in fine attended with incorruption. For the Flesh of our Lord after it had yielded to death, and was laid in the Sepulchre, was not corrupted according to the saying of the Prophet, *Thou wilt not suffer thy Holy One to see corruption*, for being preserved by the Divinity it remain'd incorruptible. So likewise the Bread of the Prothesis after it has been chewed with the teeth, and descended into the Stomach as in a Sepulchre, returns to the state of incorruption according to *John Damascene*, being united to the Substance of the Soul. And therefore those that

that depart this life, if they have participated of the Holy Mysteries of our Lord with a pure conscience, are taken up by Angels by means of what they have received, as say's Saint Chrysostom.

MR. Arnaud that always offers his Arguments as Decrees, say's, *That a man need but only read these words, that the Bread which is offered on the Altar is that very Flesh of Christ which was crucifi'd and buried, to explode the vain Arguments of Mr. Claude, and that a man who undertakes to argue against such an Evidence deserves not to be heard.* And I passing by the vanity of his Discourse, which shews how greatly 'tis his interest that I be not heard, do demand Publick Audience to discover the Nullity of his Proof. There is nothing more usual in Ecclesiastical Writers then to say of a Subject to which the Scripture gives the name of Jesus Christ, that 'tis Jesus Christ himself. Saint Chrysostom speaking of a poor man, say's, *That he is Jesus Christ himself, who suffer'd death for us.* Discourfing in another place of the Church, he say's, *That it is the Body it self of Jesus Christ.* Saint Austin expresses himself after the same manner in several places, and were it requisite, we could easily shew that this *same, or he himself*, is applied sometimes to the Poor, and sometimes to the Church; and sometimes again to every particular Believer in *Sedulus, Celsarius, Fulgentius, Ephraim, Valerian, in Alcuinus* amongst the Ancients, and *Cabalas and Feremias* amongst the Modern. Moreover how can Mr. Arnaud (who so triumphantly charges me with differing from Mr. Aubertin in an Historical Passage) maintain that the Evidence of these words of Zonarus, (*the Bread is the very Flesh it self of Jesus Christ which has been sacrific'd for us*) leaves no place for my arguings, he I say, who knows very well that the most famous Doctors of the Roman Church do teach that this Proposition, the Bread is the Body of Jesus Christ, cannot be admitted but in a Figurative Sence? Every Proposition, say's Occam, in which the Body of Jesus Christ is said to be Bread, is impossible. This Proposition, say's Bellarmine, that the Bread is the Body of Jesus Christ, if it be not taken Figuratively and in this sence, that the Bread signifies the Body of Jesus Christ, is wholly absurd and impossible, for the Bread cannot be the Body of Jesus Christ.

Chrysost. Hom.  
15. in Rom.  
lib. 4. de Sacri-  
dot.

August. in  
Psalm. 97 &  
Scrm 43. &  
53. de verb.  
Dom.

Occam quod  
4. quasi. 35.  
Bell. lib. 1. d.  
Euchy. cap 1.

SUAREZ and Vasquez affirm the same thing, and were not these three last Jesuits, I might likewise say in my turn, that here the Disciple is at variance with his Masters. In the third place I affirm that in the Discourse of Zonarus the Term of, *the same*, relates not so much to that of *Flesh*, as that of *sacrific'd*, as Mr. Arnaud renders it, and of *buried*, to signify not the Bread is this Flesh in propriety of Substance, but that it is this dead and buried Flesh; which shews how frivolous Mr. Arnaud's Proof is, for this can neither be the same death nor burial, it must then of necessity be another. In fine, 'tis but observing never so little Zonarus Discourse, and we shall find he distinguishes the Bread from the Body of Jesus Christ, for he compares the one with the other, saying, that as the Flesh of Jesus Christ suffered death and was buried, so the Bread is subject to corruption; being chewed with the teeth, eaten, and sent down into the Stomach, as in a Sepulchre; and that as the Flesh of Christ overcame corruption, so in like manner the Bread becomes incorruptible, and passes into the Substance of the Soul; which shews that his sence is, that the Bread is the Flesh it self of Jesus Christ, not Substantially, but Mystically, and consequently this pretended Evidence of Mr. Arnaud is no more than one of his Whimfies.

IN effect, suppose that Zonarus believed Transubstantiation, and that what



what he calls Bread is the proper Substance of Jesus Christ, is it possible his extravagancy has lead him so far as to believe that this Flesh is at first corruptible, and afterwards becomes incorruptible; that it is cut and chewed with the Teeth, and in fine reduced into the Substance of the Soul? Mr. Arnaud *ibid* pag#44. say's, 'tis probable that *Zonarus* abuses the word corruption and extends this Term to all the changes that happen to the Body of Jesus Christ, not in it self but in respect of the Vayl which covers it. But this evasion will not serve his turn, for *Zonarus* say's, that the Bread is subject to corruption, as being the true Flesh of Jesus Christ. Now 'tis not in respect of its Accidents, or Vayl, that 'tis the true Flesh of Jesus Christ according to the Hypothesis of Transubstantiation. It is so by the change of Substance. Not to take notice that to eat and chew Accidents with the teeth (that is to say, Figures and Colours stript from their Substance) is a singular Fancy.

THIS Passage of *Zonarus* which I now examin'd puts me in mind of another of the same Authors, who was a Grecian, and famous amongst his own People and lived about the Twelfth Century, which shall be my Eighteenth Proof. The Passage is taken out of his Commentaries on the Canons of the Apostles and Councils. See here what he writes on the 32. Canon of the Sixth Council in Trullo; *The Divine Mysteries, I mean the Bread and Wine, do represent to us the Body and Blood of our Lord, for in giving the Bread to his Disciples, he said to them, take eat this is my Body, and in delivering the Cup, he said, drink ye all of it, this is my Blood. Seeing then the Lord in his Divine Passion, after he had poured out his Blood, caused to flow from his Side pierced with a Spear, not only Blood, but likewise Water, the Church has therefore thought it necessary to mingle Water with the Wine in the Holy Mysteries.*

THERE may be made two important Reflections on this Passage; First, he say's, the Bread and Wine do represent to us the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, which cannot agree with the Doctrine of the Church of Rome, unless forced by several Interpretations unknown to the Greeks, as that by the Bread we must understand the Accidents or Appearances of Bread; and by the word *represent* an inclusive Representation of the thing it self. Secondly, that grounding as he does this Representation of the words of Christ, *This is my Body, this is my Blood*, it is clear that he has taken them himself in a sence of Representation, and believed that 'twas as much as if our Saviour had said, *This Bread represents my Body, this Cup my Blood*; for otherwise he could not ground as he has done his Proposition, that the Bread and Cup represent the Body and Blood of our Lord, on this reason, that our Saviour said, *This is my Body, this is my Blood.*

THIS Passage seeming to determine the Question in our favour, it will not be amiss therefore to consider, what may be opposed against it; to avoid its force, *Zonarus* makes use of the Term of *παρέστω*, which may be sayd to be better rend'ed, not *represent*, but *present, give, communicate*; and that the sence of this Author is not, that the Bread and Wine do represent to us the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, as Signs and Pictures represent their Original, but that they present and communicate them to us in effect, inasmuch as they contain the Substance of them, and that 'tis to confirm this Proposition he alledges the words of our Saviour, *This is my Body, this is my Blood.* But this evasion will not serve turn, if the sence and sequel of *Zonarus* his Discourse be never so little consider'd. His Design was to confute the

the *Armenians*, in shewing that there ought to be Water mingled with the Wine in the Chalice. To prove this, he asserts, we must represent in the Myttery the Water and Blood which ran down the pierced Side of our Saviour when on the Cross, and to confirm this Proposition, he has recourse to this general Maxim, that the Mysteries, which is to say, the Bread and Wine, do represent the Body and Blood of our Lord. Which plainly shews then we must not translate the Verb *παρέστω*, *present*, or *give*, for why, say's he, the Bread and Chalice give us the Body and Blood of Christ; but because Jesus Christ has said, *This is my Body, this is my Blood*. We must then put Water into the Cup, because Blood and Water issued out from our Saviour's Side. The *Armenians* have said on the contrary there must be none put in, because the Lord only made mention of his Blood; that 'tis very uncertain, whether the Mysteries give us this Water which ran down from our Lord's Side; and that supposing they do give it us, yet does it not hence follow we must mingle Water with the Wine in the Cup, the Wine alone being sufficient to be transubstantiated into the Blood and Water which accompanies the Blood. We must then necessarily (if we suppose *Zonarus* speaks sence) understand the Term of *παρέστω*, in the sence of Representation, and then his Discourse will appear rational; The Mysteries represent the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, as they were upon the Cross. Now in this State there issued from the pierced Side of Jesus Christ Blood and Water, we must then express in the Myttery this Circumstance, and to express it we must mingle Water with the Wine in the Sacred Chalice, to the end that as the Wine represents the Blood, so the Water may represent this Divine Water which gushed out together with the Blood from our Saviour's Side. And this being thus cleared up, it is hence evident that *Zonarus* understood these words of our Lord, *This is my Body, this is my Blood*, in a sence of a Mystical Representation.

## CHAP. X.

The Nineteenth Proof, that, we do not find the Greeks do teach the Doctrines which necessarily follow that of Transubstantiation. The Twentieth, is, the Testimony of sundry Modern Greeks that have written several Treatises touching their Religion. The One and Twentieth, from the Form of Abjuration which the Greeks are forc'd to make when they embrace the Religion of the Latins.

I Did affirm in my Answer to the Perpetuity, that we donot find the *Greeks* do teach any of those Doctrines which necessarily follow the Belief of the change of Substances, whence I concluded, there was no likelihood they were in this Point agreed with the *Latins*. This Consequence has disturbed Mr. *Arnaud*, and as he makes his own Dictates and those of Reason to be one and the same thing, so he has not scrupled to affirm, *That Reason rejects this as a silly extravagancy*. But so farasmuch as we have often experienced that in matters of Reason, Folly and Extravagancy, it is no sure course absolutely to rely upon Mr. *Arnaud*'s words, therefore will we again lay aside the

Lib. 10. cap. 8.  
pag. 59

Authority of his Oracles, and examine the thing as it is in it self.

FIRST, The *Greeks* do not teach the Existence of the Accidents of Bread and Wine in the *Eucharist* without any Subject, or Substance which sustains them. Now this is so necessary a Consequence of Transubstantiation, that those which believe this last, cannot avoid the teaching and acknowledging of the other, supposing they are indued with common sense. In effect it would be to charge the *Greeks* with the greatest folly, to suppose they imagin'd that the proper Substance of the Body of Jesus Christ, even the very same Body which was born of the Virgin, and is now in Heaven, does really exist on the Altar being the same in all respects, as the Bread of the *Eucharist* does appear to us to be, that is to say, white, round, divisible into little pieces, &c. and that the same things which, (as they speak) did qualify and affect the Bread before, do qualify and affect the same Body of Jesus Christ. We must not charge the whole Greek Church with such an absurdity. Whence it follows we must not attribute to her the belief of Transubstantiation; for did she make profession of believing and teaching it, she would teach likewise the existence of Accidents without a Subject; these two Doctrines being so closely linked together, that 'tis impossible to separate them unless they fall upon this fancy, that the Accidents of Bread do exist in the Body it self of Jesus Christ, or this other, namely, that which appears in the *Eucharist* is not really the Accidents of Bread, but false appearances, and pure Phantasms which deceive our senses, which is no less absurd, nor less contrary to the Doctrine of the *Greeks*.

SECONDLY, Neither do we find that they teach what the *Latins* call the *Concomitancy*, which is to say, that the Body and Blood are equally contained under each Species; but we find on the contrary, that they establish the necessity of communicating of both kinds, and ground it on the necessity there is of receiving the Body and Blood of Christ, as will appear in the Sequel of this Chapter; which is directly opposite to this *Concomitancy*. Yet is it not to be imagined but that those People who believe the Conversion of Substances, do at the same time establish this other Doctrine. For if we suppose as the Church of *Rome* does, that we receive with the mouths of our Bodies, this same Substance of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, which he had when on Earth, and has still in Heaven, it is not possible to separate in such a manner his Blood from his Body, and his Body from his Blood, as to reckon the Body to be contain'd in the only Species of Bread, and the Blood in the only Species of the Wine, seeing 'tis true that this Separation cannot be conceived without breaking the Unity of the Life which is in Jesus Christ.

THIRDLY, Neither do we find the *Greeks* have ever applied themselves to shew, how 'tis possible for our Lord's Body to exist in the *Eucharist*, stript of its proper and natural Figure, deprived of its dimensions, impalpable, indivisible, without motion and action, which is moreover another Consequence of Transubstantiation.

FOURTHLY, We do not find the *Greeks* do in any sort trouble themselves, touching the nourishment, our Bodies receive when they partake of the *Eucharist*, and yet is it certain that if we suppose they believed Transubstantiation 'tis impossible for them to obtain any satisfaction touching this matter. For should they deny this nourishment, they may be convinced of it



it by experience, and if it be referred to the proper Substance of Jesus Christ, they plunge themselves into an Abyss of Absurdities and Impieties. If it be said the Accidents nourish, besides that common sense will not suffer us to say that Colours and Figures nourish, they that affirm this do expose themselves to the derision of all the World, who know our nourishment is made by the Addition of a new Substance to ours. To affirm that God causes the Bread to reassume its first Substance, or that he immediately creates another, this is to make him work Miracles when we please, and to be too free in our disposals of the Almighty Power of God. And therefore the *Latins* have found themselves so perplexed, that some of 'em have taken one side, and some another. Some have boldly denied this nourishment, whatsoever experience there is of the contrary, as *Guitmond*, and *Algerus*; others, chosen rather to affirm the Accidents do nourish, as *Thomas Aquinas* and *Bellarmin*. Others have invented the return of the first Substance of Bread, as *Vasquez*; and others the Creation of a new Substance, as *Suarez* and others. Mr. *Ar-*  
*naud* has chosen rather to affirm, *That we are nourished, not with the Body of* *Lib. 1. cap. 6. pag. 155.*  
*Jesus Christ, but after another manner known only to God*, which shews his perplexity to be so great in this particular, that he knew not on which side to turn himself. Whilst the *Greeks* possess so great Tranquility in this Point, that it does not appear they ever found the least difficulty in it. They assure us the *Eucharist* does nourish our Bodies; but they see none of those inconveniencies which disturb the *Latins*; which clearly shews they do not believe the Conversion of Substances. For did they believe it, they would not fail to see what common sense discovers to others; and seeing it, how is it possible they should express no astonishment, nor any difficulty therein, or at least not take that side which Mr. *Arnaud* has taken, which is to leave these difficulties to Almighty God?

NEITHER do we find that the *Greeks* do trouble themselves about the alteration, or corruption which frequently happens in the Substance of the *Eucharist*, as the *Latins* do, altho the former of these have more reason for it, than the latter. For the *Latins* take all possible care to keep their Hosts from corrupting; but the *Greeks* on the contrary take none at all. And keeping as they do the Sacramental Bread sprinkled with consecrated Wine, the space of a whole year, for the use of the sick, it often happens that 'tis corrupted and full of Maggots, as it is observ'd by *Sacranus*, and the Archbishop of *Gnesne*, and consequently are more exposed to these inconveniencies than the *Latins*. Yet do they not seem to be concerned, nor inform themselves whence come these Worms, which being as they are Substances, it cannot be said they generate from bare Accidents. Neither can it be said without blasphemy, that they are made of the proper Substance of Jesus Christ.

THIS Proof may be extended farther; for 'tis certain we do not find amongst the *Greeks* any of these kind of things which depend on Transubstantiation. I mean which necessarily and wholly depend thereon. They are in this respect in a most profound silence. But it's worth our while to hear Mr. *Arnaud*. *It is indeed, say's he, a real truth, that the Greeks take lit-* *Lib. 10 cap. 8.*  
*tle notice of these Philosophical Consequences. Samonas speaks occasionally of a* *P. 52.*  
*Body in two places, and of Accidents without a Subject, the Archbishop of Gaza does the same, but both one and the other of these do this by constraint.* What signifies this tergiversating, for he ought not to say the *Greeks* speak but little hereof, seeing they speak not at all of it. This *Samonas* and this Archbishop of *Gaza* are not Authors to be quoted, seeing we shall make it appear in its  
B b 2
place,

place, that the Book which bears the name of the first of these is deservedly suspected to be counterfeit, and that the other is a Roman Profelyte wedded to the Interests of the Court of Rome. It is evident that to establish a restriction of this Consequence, Mr. Arnaud should have better Proofs. But that we may do him right, we will not conceal what he adds afterwards. I drew from the silence of the *Fathers* touching the Miracles of Transubstantiation, and its Consequences, an Argument to conclude they believed it not. He answers, that instead of *Fathers*, I should substitute the Greeks, Armenians, and Copticks of those times, for, say's he, 'tis certain that all these Christians believed Transubstantiation, as we do, and yet take no notice of all these difficulties which Mr. Claude's head is full of. This acknowledgment is sincere, and we need desire no more. The Greeks take no more notice of the difficulties arising from Transubstantiation than the Armenians and Copticks, and Mr. Arnaud grants this to be so undeniable a Truth, that he makes it the ground of an Answer.

*Ibid.* pag. 63.

OUR present business then is to know whether the Consequence I hence draw be just and good. Which he contests me, and first he say's, that all these Eastern Churches profess to believe original sin, and yet their Divines trouble not themselves about explaining this Doctrine. He adds, *that they observe the same silence in all the Questions and difficulties which the Socinians propose against the Trinity, the Person of the Holy Spirit, and the satisfaction of Christ, altho these difficulties are as obvious and sensible as those alledged against the real Presence.*

*Ibid.* pag. 58, 59.

BUT 'tis his prejudice, and not his reason that has dictated to him this Answer. For first, there is a vast difference betwixt the incomprehensible Mysteries respecting the Divinity, which being above the natural light of reason require a profound submission, and the Doctrine of Transubstantiation. The nature of the Sacraments is well known, and the matter and signs thereof are better known, which are Bread and Wine. Even the thing signifi'd, to wit, the natural Body and Blood of Jesus Christ are not only the natural Object of Reason, but likewise of Sense, and both one and the other of these Faculties can judge of it, nay, they do judge of it by a spontaneous motion, even when we would not our selves. Secondly, besides this infinite difference, which yields no room for Mr. Arnaud's comparison, the Point in hand concerns not the difficulties touching Transubstantiation, or the real Presence, but the Doctrines which necessarily attend them, and Questions which immediately arise thence of themselves. There is a great deal of difference between these two Particulars. The difficulties which are raised against a Truth, are commonly false Consequences which the Adversaries draw thence; and I confess it would not be to reason aright, absolutely to conclude that a Church holds not a Doctrine, because she troubles not herself in answering all the Objections which may be made against it. To allow these kinds of Arguments, there are distinctions to be made, and particular circumstances to be observed, without which there can be nothing concluded. But we speak here of real Consequences of a Doctrine, of Consequences, I say, which immediately shew themselves to the ordinaryest capacity, without any great Meditation and Study. Now altho the Greeks do not apply themselves to answer the Objections of the Socinians, against Original Sin, against the Mystery of the Trinity, the Person of the Holy Spirit, and Satisfaction of Christ, being perhaps not acquainted with them, yet do we plainly see amongst them the Consequences of these Doctrines. They baptise  
little

little Children, and baptise them in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, they believe the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are consubstantial; they adore the Person of the Holy Spirit, they put their trust in the death of Jesus Christ, and such like things. Wherefore should it not be the same in respect of the Consequences of Transubstantiation? Is it possible to hold this Doctrine, without thinking at the same time at least on some one of these Consequences, on the actual existence of a humane Body in several places, the existence of this Body without its usual Dimensions, the concomitancy of the Body and Blood, and on the Accidents of Bread which remain after Consecration.

THE difficulties which the *Socinians* object against the Trinity and other Doctrines mentioned by Mr. *Arnaud*, are for the most part false Consequences which these Hereticks draw from these Doctrines. It is no wonder if almost all Christians be ignorant of these Consequences. They do not spring up naturally: For 'tis passion and blindness that produces them. For I call blindness those false Lights which cause these Hereticks to behold that which is not. But that which Mr. *Arnaud* calls the difficulties of Transubstantiation are real Consequences of this Doctrine, and acknowledged to be such by them of the Church of *Rome*. Let him say as long as he will these are Philosophical Consequences, I affirm they are not so Philosophical as to hinder them from being very natural, appearing to be so, even to the light of common sense. It is most natural for a man that believes the Substance of Bread ceases to be, to think on the Accidents which remain. It is very natural for him that believes the Body of Jesus Christ, and his Blood to be substantially therein, to imagine that where the Body or Flesh is, there must the Blood be also, which is called in one word the concomitancy. It is most natural, for him that believes that 'tis not the Substance of Bread that nourishes, to consider what should cause this nourishment. It is very natural for a man that believes the Body of our Lord to be a real humane Body, to inquire how this Body can be stript of the proprieties of its Nature. It is natural, when we see Worms which ingender in the *Eucharist*, to inquire whence they take their matter. It is likewise certain that Philosophy is not properly any more concerned in these Consequences than barely to defend them, and not to illustrate them. And yet when they should not appear in themselves to the eyes of the *Greeks*, and we suppose the whole Body of this Church to be in such a prodigious stupidity, that for so many Ages since they have discovered nothing of themselves touching these things, which would be in my mind one of the boldest suppositions imaginable, yet it must be acknowledged they have seen them in the Doctrine and common belief of the *Latins*, who have filled their Religion with them since *Beringarius* his time.

NEITHER is it true, that 'twas mens Disputations which occasion'd all these Questions on the Subject of the *Eucharist*, or discover'd these Consequences we speak of. Mr. *Arnaud* would fain persuade us to it, but we know the contrary, and that 'tis the very Doctrine itself of Transubstantiation which has produced them. For they take their birth from what our eyes see, and hands touch, and experiences, which cannot but be acknowledged. In effect, they are to be found more amongst the Schoolmen than Controvertists, more amongst Authors of the Church of *Rome* than Protestants.

THERE is so great absurdity in saying the *Greeks* are ignorant of the Consequences of the Doctrine of Transubstantiation, supposing they believed



*ibid.* pag. 62.*Ibid.*

lieved it, that Mr. *Arnaud* seems to be ashamed to maintain it to the end. He turns himself on another side, and tells us that 'tis the docility of the Faith of the *Greeks* which will not permit them to behold these difficulties. But this is very absurdly answered again. For were it thus, the *Greeks* themselves would at least tell us something of it. I mean they would tell us themselves in some sort, that they know well all these Consequences, and are not so stupid, but that they see such and such Questions which arise from the Conversion of the Substances, but that they behold them as an Abyss which cannot be fathomed, or to use Mr. *Arnaud's* Eloquent Expression, *That they stifle and drown all humane thoughts in the absolute certainty of the Word of God, and infallible Authority of his Church.* They would give some reason for their silence, and endeavour to hinder its being interpreted in an ill sense. They would instruct their People in the same Modesty and Docility, and observe, that their Conduct in this particular was more discreet than that of the *Larins*. And this is what the *Greeks* would do, did they believe Transubstantiation after this gentle and quiet manner Mr. *Arnaud* attributes to them. Yet do they not so much as mention these Consequences or difficulties, they take no notice of their own silence in this respect. But Mr. *Arnaud* speaks for them without any call or order from them. He tells us his Conceptions, and those of *Ernulpheus* an English Bishop of the Twelfth Century, but not a word of the *Greeks*. The *Greeks* are in such an absolute silence on this Subject, that this silence cannot come from any other cause than the nature of their Doctrines, which not having the Consequences of Transubstantiation, do no ways oblige them to take notice of these same Consequences.

*Ibid.* pag. 59.

AND thus far I think my Argument may pass for good in the Opinion of those People that understand reason. Yet Mr. *Arnaud* will have this to be meer Folly and Extravagancy. And to shew it to be so, he tells us, *That reason it self shews us we must not disown certain and undoubted Truths under pretence, they appear contrary amongst themselves on weak conjectures; but the certainty of these Truths should make us conclude touching the falsity of these Reasonings and pretended Contrarieties.* It is, adds he, as certain a Truth as any thing of this kind can be, that the *Greeks* and other Eastern Churches do believe the real Presence and Transubstantiation, and there is nothing but may be called in question upon the same grounds, if we may doubt of the consent of all the Churches with the Church of Rome in this Doctrine. This is another Truth, that the *Greeks* take little notice of the Philosophical Consequences. Whence he concludes, that these two Truths being equally certain, they cannot be contrary, and that they shew us the falsity of Mr. *Claude's* Consequence.

IT must be acknowledged that never man had less trouble to answer an Adversary than Mr. *Arnaud*. I prove to him the *Greeks* do not believe Transubstantiation, because they make no mention of its Consequences nor difficulties. He denies my Consequence because the *Greeks* do believe Transubstantiation and that two Truths cannot be contradictory. It costs little to make such kind of Answers, and it costs no more to tell him that if it were a certain Truth (as he affirms it is) that the *Greeks* believed the conversion of Substances, he would have no need to trouble himself to answer my Arguments. For the Question being decided, there would be nothing remaining upon this account betwixt us. I believe I established the Negative, which I defend a thousand times more solidly, than he has proved his Affirmative; but if I pretended to elude his Arguments by saying, I deny the Consequence, because the *Greeks* do not believe Transubstantiation, I should be an impertinent

ment Disputer. It seems to me I should make it appear, either that the Matters of Fact which Mr. *Arnaud* proposes are not true, or that he takes them in a contrary sense, and draws from them false Conclusions; but barely to say I deny the Consequence, because it opposes my Thesis, which I hold for a certain Truth, this would be to make my self ridiculous. I know that a man that answers, supposes always his Thesis to be true, and that he has liberty to draw thence, if he can, where withal to solve the Arguments of his Adversary, but he must do it in another manner, than by saying, I deny the Consequence, because my Thesis is true. For otherwise his Adversary will tell him, and I prove that your Thesis is false by the very Argument I offer; so that this would be always to begin again. Mr. *Arnaud* will reply, he does not barely propose his Thesis for an Answer, but proposes it, as having already solidly established it by a great number of Proofs, and pretends that his Proofs surmount mine. I confess, that if this be his sense, he has right to oppose Proof against Proof, and require a comparison to be made of them, before the Reader passes his final Sentence. But I demand likewise for my part that there be comprehended in this comparison, not only one of my Proofs, but all of them together, with the Answers which I shall return him to shew their weakness and insufficiency. Which is what a judicious Reader ought to do at the end of the Dispute, in the mean time each Proof in particular should have his force, neither must he imagine to elude them, one after another, by barely opposing against them those which seem to establish the contrary. If I pretended by the only force of my Argument drawn from the silence of the *Greeks* on the Consequences of Transubstantiation to acquit my self of the examination of Mr. *Arnaud's* Proofs, and end the Dispute by this means alone, he might reasonably bring me back to this Discussion. For this would be to err in the same manner as the Author of the *Perpetuity* has done, who would decide the whole Controversie of the *Eucharist*, by an Argument drawn from the pretended Consequences of a change, without any regard to our Proofs of Fact, which conclude directly the contrary. It would signify nothing for me to alledge that my method is a method of Prescription, and not of Discussion; for this would be meer wrangling. But this is not my design. I proposed to my self, (having first established by divers most solid Reason, that the *Greeks* do not believe Transubstantiation,) to answer in its due order whatsoever Mr. *Arnaud* has offered to shew that the *Greeks* do believe it. And yet this Proof, which I here treat of, comes with the rest into the order of the Dispute. It hath then, as I said, its particular force and weight, and Mr. *Arnaud* must not imagine to overthrow it by barely opposing his Proofs against it, for before the Dispute be ended, I hope to shew, that what he terms Proofs, are but meer Paralogisms and Delusions.

TO the end the Reader may better judge of the solidity of my Proof, he must observe, that I offered it in my Answer to the *Perpetuity* only on this Ground, that there is no Law amongst the *Greeks*, or general determination, that establishes Transubstantiation, that none of their Councils have decided it, none of their Confessions of Faith comprehended it, nor any of their publick Catechisms asserted it. Now when men differ touching a matter of Fact, they usually have recourse to the place where they may most reasonably expect satisfaction, and if it does not appear there in it self, sense obliges them to address themselves to its Consequences, and if the Consequences do not manifest themselves any more than the Fact it self, they draw thence a negative Argument, which in its place, has all the force that can be desired.

Answer to  
the Second  
Treatise of  
*Perp.* cap. 8.  
pag. 442. Edit.

desired. This method have I followed in this Answer to Mr. *Arnaud*, for I produce not this Argument drawn from Consequences, till I manifested that the Fact it self here in question, that is to say, Transubstantiation, does not appear any where amongst the *Greeks*, neither in respect of the Terms, nor thing which the Terms signifie, and to justify it I have produced what Mr. *Arnaud* has alledged to the contrary.

IN effect, if you set aside the Latiniz'd *Greeks*, such as *Bessarion*, *Emanuel Calecas*, *Plufiadenus*, the counterfeit *Greeks*, such as the Baron of *Spartaris*, and the Archbishop of *Gaza*, whom I can prove to be a Pensioner of the Court of *Rome*, and others that are notoriously suspected, such as the pretended *Samonas*, the Monk *Agapius*, the six Priests of the Patriarchate of *Antioch*, and the Synod of *Cyprus* in the Year 1668. with some Acts that have been alter'd by the *Latins* already mention'd by us, all the rest consists only in Arguings and Consequences, which have even in this quality neither Evidence nor certainty, as will appear hereafter. For as to Mr. *Arnaud*'s vaunting, that he has shewed Transubstantiation, hath been defined by Councils, that it is expressly contain'd in the profession of Faith sign'd by the *Sarrasins*, and in the Ecclesiastical Writings of the *Greeks*, is what he ought not to affirm on such flight Grounds, seeing People may be convinced of the contrary by the bare reading of these pretended Councils of *Cyrellus*, *Berrhea*, and *Partenius*, and Passages he produces as well of the profession of Faith of these *Sarrasin* Profelytes, as Ecclesiastical Writings; for 'tis certain we find Transubstantiation neither defined, nor expressly taught therein.

THIS Belief then appearing not of it self in the Greek Church, and the expressions she makes use of being lyable to sundry Interpretations, a prudent man will consider the Doctrines which depend thereon, and which are the inseperable Consequences of it; for if these Doctrines do no more appear than the Substantial Conversion, this must be granted a new Proof which confirms the first, and very much helps us to make our final Judgment. For as I said, it is not possible that the *Greeks* can be in this Point agreed with the *Latins*, without believing at the same time with them, that the Accidents of Bread which remain, subsist without being upheld by the Substance of Bread, that the Body of Jesus Christ is substantially present in several places at one time, that it exists in the *Eucharist* void of these natural dimensions, and that the Body and Blood are equally found under both Species by virtue of the concomitancy, &c. These are the necessary dependancies on Transubstantiation, and the *Greeks* are so much the more obliged to explain themselves, in as much as the Terms by which they are said to express their Belief touching this last particular are equivocal, and capable of several senses, for they ought at least to shew hereupon what is their meaning. So that having not done it, it is a Proof they are not agreed with the Church of *Rome* on the principal Point of the Conversion. And yet notwithstanding all this, if we will believe Mr. *Arnaud*, my Proof is but a foolish and extravagant one. He may say what he pleases, but it seems to me by this, that for the most part there is no agreeing with him under any other Terms than the renouncing of our Reason. But to proceed.

I shall add to what I have already represented, the Testimonies of some Modern *Greeks*, who have given us exact descriptions of their Religion, and yet not a title of Transubstantiation, altho their design and occasions which set them on writing, obliged them not to be silent on so important an Article.



cle. I might begin with *Jeremias* the Patriarch of *Constantinople*; for let a man read over never so many times his Answers to the Divines of *Wittemberg*, yet cannot he find the least intimation of a substantial Conversion, unless he suffers his mind to be corrupted by Mr. *Arnaud's* Declamations, but it will be more proper to refer this examination to the following Book, wherein, the order and sequel of this Dispute will oblige us to mention it.

WE have *Christopher Angelus* his Letter, given us by *George Felavius* a *Lutheran* Divine of *Dantzic*; which *Angelus* was a *Greek*, a man both pious and learned. He greatly suffer'd amongst the *Turks* for his Religion, and at length came into *England* to end there his Days in peace and quietness. His Letter contains a large Account of the Customs of the *Greeks* touching the *Eucharist*, wherein he is so far from asserting the substantial Conversion of the *Latins*, that he expounds on the contrary these words of Body and Blood by them of Bread and Wine. The Priest, say's he, carrying in his hands the Holy Things, draws near to the People and stops at the door of the Sanctuary, where at once he distributes to every one the Body and Blood of our Lord, that is to say, Bread and Wine mixed, saying, this Servant of God receives, in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, for the Remission of his Sins, Amen.

Statut & ritus Ecclesie Græcæ à Christoph. Angelo. cap. 23.

WE have a Confession of Faith Compiled by *Metrophannus Critopulus* at *Helmstat* in the Year 1625. He was not long after made Patriarch of *Alexandria*. There is a whole Chapter in this Confession, the Title whereof is, *περὶ τῆς κυρίου δειπνῆς*, of the Lord's Supper. In which having established the use of leavened Bread, the Unity of this Bread to represent our Unity with *Jesus Christ*, and one another, he adds. That the consecrated Bread is truly the Body of Christ, and the Wine undoubtedly his Blood, but the manner, say's he, of this change is unknown and unintelligible to us. For the Understanding of these things is reserved for the Elect in Heaven, to the end we may obtain the more favour from God by a Faith void of curiosity. Those that seek after the reason of all things overthrow Reason and corrupt Knowledge, according to the Observation of *Theophrastus*, seeing then this Mystery is really the Body and Blood of *Jesus Christ*, 'tis therefore very pertinently called by *Saint Ignatius*, a remedy against Mortality, a Medicine that purifies us, and an Antidote which preserves us from Death, and makes us live in God by *Jesus Christ*.

Confessio Cath. & Apost. in Orient. Ecclesia per Metrophannem Critopulum.

HERE we find the Bread to be really the Body of *Jesus Christ*, and that it suffers a change, but we find not that the Substance of the one is really changed into that of another, which is precisely the Transubstantiation of the *Latins*. But on the contrary that the manner of this change is unknown to us whilst on Earth, which is to say, in a word he would have us indeed to believe a change, (for the Bread is not naturally the Body of Christ) but will not suffer us to determine the manner of it, which what is it, but a plain rejecting of Transubstantiation, seeing that it is itself the Determination of this manner. It will be replied that they of the Church of *Rome*, do likewise acknowledge Transubstantiation to be an unaccountable change, that we must believe it without troubling our selves how 'tis possible, and Mr. *Arnaud* has not fail'd to produce in this sense, the Passage of *Metrophannus*, which I now mention'd according to his usual Custom, which is to turn to his advantage, even those things that are most against him. But there is a great deal of difference between saying, there is a change which makes the Bread become the Body of Christ, altho we know not the manner thereof, and affirming there is a substantial change which converts the Substance

of Bread into that of the Body of Jesus Christ, altho we know not how this comes to pass. By the first we keep our selves in the general *Idea* of a change without descending to a particular determination. By the second we determine what this change is, to wit, a change of one Substance into another. In the first, the expression is still retain'd which supposes the Bread remains, to wit, *That the Bread is the Body of Christ*; but in the second, this expression is willingly laid aside, because it cannot be admitted but under the benefit of Figures and Distinctions. The first is the Language of the *Greeks*, the second that of the *Latins*.

*Ibid. cap. 91.*

BUT before we leave this Confession of *Metrophanus*, it will not be amiss to make two reflexions thereon, the one, that when he establishes the necessity of the Communion, in both kinds, he grounds it on the necessity of partaking as well of the Body as Blood of Christ, and alledges for this effect that saying in the sixth Chapter of Saint *Fohn*, *If you eat not the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his Blood, you will have no life in you*. Now this reason manifestly opposes the pretended concomitancy of the *Latins*, and Transubstantiation it self; for if there be made a conversion of the Bread into the proper Substance of the Body of Christ, such as it is at present, that is to say, living and animate, those that receive the Species of Bread do partake as well of the Blood as Body, and it cannot be said, there is any necessity of receiving the Cup, by this reason that we must partake of the Blood, without falling into a manifest contradiction, which is likewise the reason wherefore in the Church of *Rome* it is believed to be sufficient to communicate of one kind.

*Ibid.*

THE second Consideration concerning *Metrophanus*, is, that this Author discoursing, towards the end of his Chapter, of the Sacrament which the *Greeks* reserve for the sick, say's, *That they believe, according to the Doctrine of the first Oecumenical Council, that the Mystery being reserved, remains still a Holy Mystery, and never loses the vertue it once received*. For as *Wool*, say's he, *being once dyed, keeps its colour; so the Sanctification remains in these Mysteries ever indelible, and as the remains which are taken off the King's Table are always the remains of the King's Table while they last, altho kept several years, so it cannot be but that the remains of this Holy Mystery, are the remains of the Body and Blood of Christ*. Let Mr. *Arnaud* tell us sincerely whether this be the Style of a man that believes Transubstantiation, and whether he himself would call that which is reserved of the Sacrament, *the remains of the Body and Blood of Christ*, and compare the Sanctification which the Bread receives to the colour wherewith *Wool* is dyed. Whether he would say, that this Sanctification remains in the Mysteries, and is *indelible*. For 'tis certain this gives us the *Idea* of Bread, which, so remaining, yet receives an Impression of Grace and Holiness, which resides in it as in its Subject, and makes it to be the Body of Christ, but no wise transubstantiated Bread. If we were to understand by the vertue, not an Impression of the Holy Spirit in the Bread, but an Action that changed the Substance of the Bread into the Substance of the Body of Christ, it might then be said the effect which is produced by this Action, or Conversion, remains, that is to say, that 'tis ever the Substance of the Body of Christ. But it could not be said, as *Metrophanus* does, that the Action it self, that is to say, the Sanctification, always remain'd, because it would be conceived in this case as a momentary Action, which ceases to be, as soon as the Conversion is made. Neither could it be moreover compared to the dye which *Wool* receives, seeing *Wool* remains still *Wool* in respect of its Substance. In fine, if *Metrophanus* means no more but that the Mystery

stery remains still what it has been made, to wit, the Body of Christ, in Substance, there can be no reason given, why, being able without doubt to explain himself easily, and clearly, he chose rather to use obscure and perplexed Terms, which have an Ayr wholly contrary to his Mind, and need a Commentary and Distinctions, than to use clear and natural expressions, for how many Commentaries need we to render intelligible, that this *indelible* Sanctification which the Bread receives, and is like to the dye which Wool takes, signifies the proper Substance of the Body and Blood of our Saviour?

I will finish this Chapter with another Proof, taken from the Form of Abjuration which the *Greeks* make when they leave their Religion to embrace the *Roman*. One of the Articles they are made to confess is this, *That the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ with his Soul and Divinity, are really, truly, and substantially, in the Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist, and that there is made a Conversion of the whole Substance of Bread into the Body, and of the whole Substance of Wine into the Blood, which Conversion the Catholick Church calls Transubstantiation.* The Greek runs thus, *ἐν τῷ ἁγιασμένῳ ἑὺχαριστίας μυστηρίῳ ὑπάρχον ἀληθῶς, ὄντως, καὶ ὁπωδιῶς τὸ Σῶμα καὶ τὸ αἷμα μετὰ τῷ Ἰησοῦ καὶ θεότητι τῆς κυρίας ἡμῶν Ἰουδῆς Χριστοῦ, καὶ ὅλῳ μέρει τῷ ἁγίῳ ὅσαν εἰς τὸ σῶμα, ὅλῳ ὃ τῷ τῷ οἶνῳ ἐξίσταται εἰς τὸ αἷμα μεταβάλλεσθαι, ἢ μεταβολῶν ἡ Καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία μυστήριον ὀνομάζει.*

HERE's clearly expressed the substantial Conversion, καὶ ὅσαν μεταβολῶν, and Transubstantiation μεταβολῶν, for thus do the *Greeks* speak when they become *Latins*, and 'tis thus they ought to speak that believe this Doctrine. But why must the *Greeks* profess this when they change their Religion, if they held the same Language before? Is it usual, when Profelytes are received to make them profess Doctrines common both to the Religion they forsake, and that which they embrace? Do the *Greeks* do so by the *Latins* that pass over to them, and is not this a plain sign that their former Belief touching this Point was not that of the Church of *Rome*? For 'tis to be observ'd that this Formulary contains first the Symbol with the addition of the *filioque*, which the *Greeks* do not receive. Then it contains the Decrees of the *Florentine Council*, which the *Greeks* reject, and in fine the Articles determin'd in the Council of *Trent*, and in respect of this last part, 'tis the same profession of Faith which them of our Communion make when they embrace that of *Rome*.

IT will be perhaps replied, that amongst these Articles there are two, to wit, that of the Invocation of Saints, and worshipping of Images, which there is no necessity of making the *Greeks* confess, seeing they practised them already in their Religion, whence it does not follow that they believed not Transubstantiation, altho found expressed in this Form of Confession, for there ought to be the same Judgment made of this, as of the other two Articles. But if this Answer happens to be approved by Mr. *Arnaud*, I will tell him 'tis of no weight. For as to the Invocation, the *Greeks* will not practise it to the Saints of the Church of *Rome*, which they do not acknowledge. When I enter into a Church of the *Latins*, say's Gregory the Confessor in the History of Syropulus, I adore not the Image of any Saint, because I know not any one of them that I see. They blaspheme, say's Sacranus (speaking of the *Russians*) against the Churches Saints, who lived in the Communion, and Obedience of the Roman Church. In the Invocation of Saints, say's the Jesuit *Scarga*, they are guilty of several absurdities. This Article then was not

*Hist. Conc. Flav. lib. 4. cap. 31. Reliq. Quibon. art. 6.*

*Error Mos. eo Scarga art. 9.*



needless, but on the contrary there was some kind of necessity to insert it in the formulary. And as to that of Images, we all know that the *Greeks* do abhor the Images of the *Latins*, and therefore call their Worship in this respect Idolatry.

*De Repub.  
Turcor. pag.  
46.  
Voyages of  
the Sieur Bé-  
nard. lib. cap.  
24.*

*THE* *Greeks*, say's *William Postel*, call the *Western People* that are subject to the Church of Rome, grand Idolaters, because we have Statues erected. They have no other Images in their Churches, say's the *Sieur Benard*, than the Crucifix, the Virgin Mary, Saint John the Evangelist, and Saint George which are Painted in Tables. They teach, say's the *Jesuit Richard*; that carved Images are Idols, and that 'tis unlawful to worship any others than those which are painted.

*POSSEVIN* the *Jesuit* reckons likewise this amongst the rest of their Errours. That they will not suffer a carved Image of our Saviour to be set up in their Churches. And the *Sieur de la Boulay le Goux* asserts the same thing, viz. that they suffer no other Images but those that are painted against the Walls, their reason being, that carved Images are forbid in Moses his Law; which *Nicholas de Nicolai* confirms, telling us, They suffer no carved Images in their Churches, only Table-Pieces.

*Possevin Bib.  
lior. select.  
lib. I.*

*IT* was then moreover needful to insert in the profession of Faith this Article of Images. But there can be nothing alledged like this touching that of Transubstantiation. There could be no reason obliging the Popes to require an express Declaration from the *Greek* Profelytes, unless that of this Doctrine being not taught in the Church they left, and therefore they must change their Faith as well as their Communion. In effect the Terms of the *Greeks*, are for the most part of 'em general, and altho the *Latins* do abuse them in their Disputes, to make us thereby believe they hold the substantial Conversion, yet when the matter in the main relates to their own interest out of the Dispute, they do not then find them sufficient for the forming a true Idea of this Conversion, seeing there has been made an express Article touching this Point conceived in the Terms of the Council of *Trent*. This is so true, that when they send into the East, those that have been educated in their Seminaries, they make 'em sign this same Formulary, to the end they may not fail to labour at the propagation of this Doctrine. It is no longer μεταβολή, nor μεταποίησις, nor μετασπικέσις, Change, Mutation, Conversion, there is not enough in this to make a good Catholick, it is μεταβολή ἢ σῆμα, μετασῆμα, a Change of Substance, Transubstantiation. Mr. *Arnaud* torments himself to make us acknowledge the Doctrine of the Church of Rome in the common expressions of the *Greeks*. But that he may avoid this trouble hence forward, let me only advise him to consult Pope Gregory the Thirteenth, for it was by his Order this Formulary we mention'd has been compiled.

## CHAP. XI.

The Two and Twentieth Proof, taken from an Answer in Manuscript of Metrophanus Critopulus, to some Questions offer'd him by Mr. Oosterwieck. The Three and Twentieth, is, another Answer in Manuscript of Meletius Archbishop of Ephesus, and Hieroteus, Abbot of the Monastery of Cephalenia. The Four and Twentieth, is, the Testimony of Jeremias a Doctor of the Greek Church. The Five and Twentieth, is the Testimony of Zacharias Gerganus.

**W**HILST I am endeavouring to defend the Truth against the vain Subtilties of Mr. *Arnaud*, I hear, that several pious, and learned men, who cannot indure the World should be thus imposed on, do interest themselves in this Dispute, and having read this Famous Book I examine, they have wonder'd its Author should with such confidence affirm, that the *Greeks* believe the Transubstantiation of the *Latins*. Some of 'em have sent me some Manuscripts, which they judged proper for the clearing up of this Question. I will produce them then here, naming the Persons from whom I receiv'd them, to the end if any doubt arise, they may address themselves to them, from whom I had them for their satisfaction.

*MONSIEUR Spanheim*, a Reverend Minister, and Divinity Professor, in the University of *Heydelberg*, sent me an extract of a Manuscript he has by him, containing Seven and Twenty Answers, made by the same *Metrophanus Critopulus*, whom I mention'd in the foregoing Chapter, to so many Questions that were put to him by *Monsieur Oosterwieck*, who was then in the East, and was so curious as to inform himself, not concerning the particular sense of *Metrophanus* touching these Articles, but of the whole *Greek Church*, in which he then held a very considerable rank, being Patriarch of *Alexandria*. One of these Questions was thus expressed in Greek, *Τι αὖ ἐπιμένει ἐκκλησίαι περὶ τῶν ἐπισημαζόντων τῶν χειρῶν καὶ ποδῶν ἀφ' ὧν φερεται*, I desire to know the Opinion of the *Greek Church* touching these Articles of the *Christian Faith*. The Three and Twentieth Article has for its Title, *περὶ τῆς θυσίας καὶ μυστηρίου, πόθεν ὁ Χριστὸς σωματικῶς παρεστὶν ἐν ταῖς ἀγίαις δεσφαῖς*. Of the Sacrifice of the Mass, to wit, whether Christ be corporally present in the Sacrament. The Answer is this; We call the Lord's Supper a Sacrifice, but a Sacrifice that is spiritual and commemorative; spiritual as having nothing of carnal in it, according to that of our Saviour, the words which I speak to you are Spirit and Life. Commemorative, as being perform'd in remembrance of the Sacrifice once offer'd on the Cross, according to that other expression of our Saviour, do this in remembrance of me. Which is what is taught by *Saint Chrysostom*, and the whole Church, saying, this is done in remembrance of what was done then, do this says our Saviour in remembrance of me. We offer not any other Sacrifice, as did heretofore the High Priest, under the Old Testament; but we offer every day the same, or to speak better we commemorate this Sacrifice. But we never believed Christ was bodily present in the Mystery. Had the *Greek Church* believed Transubstantiation, it was here a fit place to declare it, and to reply yes, we do believe  
tha t

that Jesus Christ is corporally present in the Sacrament, inasmuch as that the proper Substance of his Body lies covered under the Accidents of Bread, or some such like equivalent thing. It will be to no purpose to alledge that *Metrophanus* means Christ is not corporally in it, that is to say, after the manner of visible and sensible Bodies with all their Dimensions; for this would be to make him return a captious Answer, and such a one as is unbecoming an honest man, seeing he well saw this was not the Question askt him, and that the Term of *corporally* in the Question propounded, respected the proper Substance of his Body. So that the force of this Testimony cannot be evaded. This *Metrophanus* was Patriarch of *Alexandria* in the Year 1642.

THE said Mr. *Spanheim* imparted to me the Answer of *Meletius* Metropolitan of *Ephesus* made some twenty years since to the Divines at *Leyden*, touching some Questions they proposed to him. They askt him amongst other things, εἰ δὲ προσφέρῃ εὐχὰς πρὸς τιμὴν θεοποιίας τῇ μακαρίᾳ παρθένῳ ἢ ἀγγέλοις, καὶ εἰ χεὶρ προσέβηεν ἐν τῇ εὐχαριστίᾳ, τὸ τ' ὅτι, ἐν τῇ κυριακῇ δέπνῳ γινέσθαι μετέσθαιον ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ. Whether we may pray to Angels, or the Virgin Mary, and religiously worship them; and whether we must believe the Bread to be transubstantiated in the Sacrament. Observe here what he answers, Ἀποφαίνομαι λέγων ὅτι ἔδην ταύτων κατέχην προσκινῶν, καὶ τὴν μὲν δόγματα ἐξέειπεν μοι δόξαζον ἀνδράσι, πλὴν τὰ παρὰ κατὰ τὴν αὐτῆς μαθητῶν. I declare, say's he, there are none of these things to be believed, for I may not believe the Doctrines of men, before those of Christ and his Apostles. The Supercription is, ΜΕΛΕΤΙΟΥ ΤΑΚΕΙΟΥ Ἀρχιεπισκοπῆς μετروπολίτις ἐφέζης. Adjoyning unto which is the consent of *Hierotheus*, in these words, καὶ γὰρ ἱερόθεος Ἀββάτης ὁ ἐν κεφαλῶν Ἀρχιμανδρίτης ὁμοφρονῶν ἐν ἅπασιν τοῖς ἀνδρῶν τῶν πολυεροτάτων καὶ σωφροτάτων μετروπολίτις ἐφέζης, καὶ κυρίως μελέτιος ὑπερίμω καὶ ἐξάρχῃ πάσης Ἀσίας, καὶ τῷ αὐτῷ δειλοπολίτι. And I Hierotheus an Archimandrite Abbot of Cephalaria, am of the same mind in all things here above contained with the most holy and prudent Metropolitan of Ephesus, and all Asia, according to what he has declared.

D R. *Benjamin Woodroff*, an Eminent Divine in the Church of England, and Chaplain to the Duke of York, has favour'd me with an Extract, whose Original he has by him, and which was given him by its Author, being then at Oxford. It is a Declaration of the sense of the Greek Church, drawn up by a Greek Doctour, named *Feremias*. Observe here its Contents. The different use of the Mystery of the Eucharist having produced different Sentiments, some celebrating it with unleavened Bread, others with that which is leavened and kneaded, some believing it to be only a Sign, others that the Bread is changed and alter'd by the Word. Those that believe the change are the Western People, which administer this Sacrament according to the Doctrine of the Roman Church, and all the rest hold the Sign except the Eastern People; For the Eastern Church differs from both these, and yet teaches a Doctrine that is easie, full of piety, and free from contradiction. She affirms then that the Bishop, or Priest, in the Divine Service holds the place of Christ, making the Propitiation for the sins of the People, and that by the Holy Invocation of God's Name, and mention of the Divine Words of our Saviour, the spiritual Grace descends that sanctifies the Bread and Wine, and changes them, not into the sensible, but spiritual Body of Jesus Christ. And as to those that assert the Substance of Bread and Wine is changed into the natural Flesh of Jesus Christ, if they understand hereby a supernatural change after a spiritual manner, those that do thus speak, concur in their Opinion with the Eastern Church. But seeing they will have this to be sensibly effected,



effected, our Church does therein disagree with them, altho they have recourse to another way of speaking, in telling us of Accidents and Species, and such like things, which none of the Ancients ever thought of, much less mention'd. For the Fathers of the Eastern Church have been ever averse to Novelties and Contentions, which tend to the ruine of Souls, not only detesting those Doctrines which are heretical, and divide the Church, but which, in disturbing its Peace, eclipse its Glory. The Supercription is, Ὁ ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ Ἱερεμίας ὁ ἀνατολικῆς ἐκκλησίας διδασκάλος, *Jeremias Doctour of Divinity in the Eastern Church.*

ALTHO we learn no new thing from the Testimony of this Author, yet does it confirm, and illustrate several matters. First, that the Sentiment of the *Greeks* touching the *Eucharist*, is not in any thing the same with that of the Church of *Rome*, but a middle way betwixt the Doctrine of the *Latins* and Protestants. Secondly, That although the *Greeks* do use the Term μεταβολή, *change*, yet do they not understand thereby a real change of one Substance into another, which the *Latins* have invented, but a spiritual change wrought by the Grace of the Holy Spirit which sanctifies the Bread and Wine. Thirdly, That when 'tis said the Substance of Bread and Wine is changed into the natural Flesh of Christ, this must be understood in a spiritual manner to be conformable to the Sentiment of the Eastern Church. Fourthly, That those of the Church of *Rome* understanding it (as they do) in a sensible manner, the *Greeks* reject them and their Communion. Fifthly, To the end there may be no pretence left for cavilling on the Term of *sensibly*, in saying the *Roman* Church understands not that the Body of Christ is visible and palpable in its natural form, in the Sacrament, he declares that he well knows she makes use of other expressions, namely, of Accidents and Species; meaning that this is still to understand it *sensibly* to assert our Saviour's proper Substance is in this Mystery, although covered with the Species and Accidents of Bread. And that this is a Novelty the *Greeks* have ever rejected, and of which the Ancients have not made the least mention. If Mr. *Arnaud* likes this let him make the best use he can of it, in the meantime we will pass on to another Proof.

MATTHEW Caryophilus, titular Archbishop of *Iconia*, a Latinised Greek, and almost of the same stamp and temper, as *Arundinus* and *Leo Allatius*, has published a refutation of some Propositions taken out of a Catechism made by a Greek Gentleman whom he calls *Zacharias Gergannus*; *Allatius* say's he was a Bishop. But be he what he will, *Caryophilus* uses him after a dreadful manner, terming his Propositions Blasphemies, and calling him *Serpent*, *Basilisk*, *Wolf*, *the Devil's Instrument*, *worse than the Devil himself*, a *Lutheran*. But 'tis a usual thing with these Gentlemen to load mens Persons with Injuries, when their Doctrines agree not with theirs. They thus begin, continue, and end their Refutations. It cannot then be taken ill, if laying aside their Injuries, I only affirm, that *Caryophilus* very impertinently charges this Greek with his being a *Lutheran*; for it is apparent from the Propositions he recites, and what he say's in his Preface, that he was a true Greek, and maintain'd the Maxims of his Religion and Church; and moreover a real lover of his Country. He opposes (amongst other things) the addition of the *filioque*, in the Symbol, and attacks the *Azuma* of the *Latins*. He affirms there is but one Holy Church, which is the Catholick, Apostolical, and Eastern; which does not well agree with the Title he has given him of a *Lutheran*; and 'tis plainly seen he has given it him only to make him suspected by his own Countrymen, and hinder us from any advantage by his Testimony.

Refutatio  
pseud-Christi-  
anae Catechesis  
edita à Zacha-  
ria Gergano  
Græco Aucto-  
re Matthæo  
Caryophil.  
Romæ 1631.  
Blasph. 61.

SO that the single Authority of *Caryophilus*, being not sufficient to hinder us from considering this Author's Testimony, notwithstanding his pretended Lutheranism. I shall therefore produce here some of his Propositions, which he himself has taken out of his Catechism. The LXI is this. *The Holy Communion consists of two Substances, the one visible, and th'other invisible, the visible Substance is the Bread and Wine, the invisible Substance is the Word of Christ, This is my Body, this is my Blood.* The Question in this Dispute being only, Whether the *Greeks* believe Transubstantiation, it will be therefore sufficient for me to show by this Testimony, that the visible Substance of Bread and Wine remain, so that I am not concerned to know in what sense this Author calls the Words of Christ the *invisible Substance* of the Sacrament. Yet will I affirm his sense is clear enough; for in respect of the Bread and Wine which are in effect Substances, it is plain we must take the Term of *Substance* in its natural signification; but in respect of the Words of Christ, which in effect are not Substances, it is likewise apparent we must understand this expression in a metaphorical sense, seeing by it is meant no more, but that the internal and mystical virtue of this Sacrament is contain'd in these words, *This is my Body*, because these words shew us we must not take these things as mere Bread and Wine, but as the Body and Blood of Christ, of which they are the Mystery. Which is what he understands by this *invisible Substance*, that is to say, the force and efficacy of the Sacrament; for had not our Saviour said of the Bread, *This is my Body*, it would be no more than Bread, proper to nourish our Bodies, whereas the Faith we have in these words shews us in it another spiritual Substance, which nourishes our Souls.

Ibid. Blasphem. 65.

THE LXV. Proposition does no less oppose the substantial Conversion; for it contains these words, *That the Laity which communicate but of one only kind, receive an imperfect Communion*, which is directly opposite to one of the necessary Consequences of Transubstantiation; which is the Concomitancy. And to prevent any cavilling touching the sense of this Proposition, as if he would say only, that this Communion is imperfect in respect of the Institution of Christ, who has ordain'd we should partake of both kinds, and not in respect of the Body and Blood it self; which we fully receive under one, he thereupon explains himself clearly in the 68 Proposition. *This is an impious Doctrine of the Papist*, say's he, *and of which Pope Eugenius has been the first Author, that where the Body of Christ is, there is likewise his Blood, and for this reason it is not necessary that the Laity receive the Communion under both kinds.* So that here the pretended concomitancy is overthrown, and consequently Transubstantiation, inasmuch as one cannot subsist without the other. This Author lived about the Year 1630.

Ibid. Blasphem. 6.

## CHAP. XII.

*The Twenty Sixth Proof, taken from the Confession of Faith of Cyrillus Lucar, Patriarch of Constantinople, and what followed thereupon.*

**H**AD Mr. *Arnaud* contented himself, (to the end he might get clear from the Confession of Faith of *Cyrillus*) in saying this Patriarch studied *Fohn Calvin*; and was a great admirer of his Doctrine. That his Confession of Faith contradicted several Articles of the Belief of the *Greeks*; that 'twas condemned by two Councils held since his death, and that there is no reason the Doctrine of the whole Greek Church (touching the *Eucharist*) should be determined by his opinion; had he I say only thus expressed himself, we should not have complained against him, but endeavoured to satisfy him in every one of these particulars. But instead of containing himself within these bounds, he has fallen foul on the Person of *Cyrillus* himself, whom he treats as a hireling, charging him with receiving five hundred Crowns in *Germany*, for subscribing to Articles against the Catholics, as a sacrilegious Person and Usurper, who diverted the money he gathered in *Candia* under the name of his Patriarch *Meletius*, to the purchasing the Patriarchate of *Alexandria* to the prejudice of another, that was elected by common consent, as an insatiable ambitious Wretch, who not content with the Patriarchate of *Alexandria*, would have that of *Constantinople*; and which is yet worse, as a Villain and Murderer, who having caused his Predecessor *Timotheus* to be poisoned, got afterwards Janissaries to strangle him, who assisted him in this detestable Action. Tho I resolved not to be concerned at Mr. *Arnaud's* Passion, which cannot but be displeasing to good People of either Communion, yet I may tell him, that seeing he publishes these Accusations against a Person that is dead, he must be able to prove by good Testimony his charge to be true, but having no better an Author than *Allatius* for this, he cannot take it ill, if I affirm, his account of this Person to be meer Calumny and Forgery.

*Lib. 4. cap. 6.  
pag. 382, 83.*

HE confesses, he relates this whole Story chiefly upon the credit of *Allatius*, who made it his business to inform himself, and being a Greek, ought sooner to be believed than Dutch or Switzers Ministers, and especially than *Hottinger*, who is one of the most passionate Ministers, and least sincere Writers he ever read. Let the Dutch or Switzers Ministers, and especially *Hottinger* be what he pleases, what signifies this to the Confirmation of the Truth of these Accusations, and the sincerity of *Allatius*? When the Ministers shall positively affirm any thing in favour of *Cyrillus*, which they cannot prove; then Mr. *Arnaud* may question their Testimony, and term them passionate Persons not worthy of credit. If *Allatius* relates the same thing otherwise than the Ministers, he may say he is sooner to be believed than they, and see what answer we will make him; but for *Allatius* to charge *Cyrillus* with such hainous Crimes, and to authorize his Impostures, we must be told that *Hottinger* is no good Author, and that *Allatius* is more worthy of credit, this is mere mockery; For to decide the Question, whether what *Allatius* affirms be true or fabulous, *Hottinger* and other Ministers are not concerned, we are only to inquire whether *Allatius*



cites any Witnesses, or whether he himself is an Author worthy of credit. *Allatius*, say's Mr. *Arnaud*, has taken special care to inform himself. He must tell us then what his Informations contain, and not affirm such important matters, without good Grounds. He was a Greek by Nation, very true, but a Greek that forsook his Religion to embrace the Roman Faith; a Greek whom the Pope preferred to be his Library-Keeper, a Person the most wedded of all men to the Interests of the Court of Rome, a Person than whom none could be more malicious against those he took to be his Adversaries, and especially against *Cyrillus*, and those called Schismatical Greeks, a man full of words but little sence. His Religion and Office of Library-Keeper will not be called in question by those that ever heard of him. His Zeal for the Interest of the Court of Rome appears in the very beginning of his Book, *De perpetua consensione*, for observe here how he expresses himself, in the Pope's Favour: The Roman Prelate, say's he, is independent, he judges all the World, and is judged of none, we must obey him altho he governs unjustly, he gives Laws, but receives none, and changes them when he pleases, he makes Magistrates, determines Points of Faith, and orders as seems good to him the greatest Affairs in the Church. If he would err, he cannot; for he cannot be deceived himself, neither can he deceive others, and when an Angel should affirm the contrary, being guarded, as he is with the Authority of Christ, he cannot change. The sharpness, wherewith he treats those against whom he writes, such as *Chytrens*, *Creyton*, the Archbishop of *Corfon*, and some others, appears by the bare reading of his Writings; every period honouring them with these kind of Titles, *Sots*, *Lyers*, *Blockheads*, *Hellish*, and impudent Persons, and other such like Terms which are no Signs of a moderate Spirit. To prove the Conformity of the Greek Church with the Roman in Essentials, he takes for his Principle to acknowledge none for the true Church, but that Party which has submitted to the Roman See, and in respect of the other Greeks, whom he calls *Hereticks*, and *Schismaticks*, he fiercely maintains that a good course is taken with 'em, when they can be reduced by Fire and Sword; That *Hereticks* must be exterminated and punished, and if obstinate, put to death and burnt, these are his Expressions; and as to what concerns *Cyrillus*, we need but read what he has written of him to be perswaded of his partiality and injustice. Does Mr. *Arnaud* think he has done fairly to borrow the Weapons of such a man to defend himself against the aforementioned Confession of Faith.

*Allat. de Perpet. Conf. lib. 1. cap. 2.*

*Vide Allat. de Perpet. Conf. lib. 3. cap. 155. 16, 17, 18. &c. advers. Chreygt. passim.*

*Allat. de Perpet. Conf. lib. 2. cap. 13. Ibid. lib. 3. cap. 11.*

*CYRILLUS* had Adversaries whilst living, and after his death; but, he has had likewise Defenders of his Innocency, and Admirers of his Virtues. It is the Fate of great men to be persecuted, and those that are acquainted with the Eastern Affairs, must acknowledge there is no place more dangerous and exposed to more Revolutions and Tempests, than the Patriarchate of *Constantinople*. Besides the Traverses, which Envy, and particular Interests stirred up against *Cyrillus*, he had the whole Party of the *Latins* and false *Greeks* against him, who looked upon him as an Obstacle that withstood their old Design, to bring over that Church to the Roman See. He was assay'd both by Promises and Threatnings, as *Allatius* himself acknowledges, but they found him unmovable; and this is the real cause of their after hatred.

*Ibid.*

IT is certain *Cyrillus* had a great aversion to the Romish Religion, and his Inclination led him rather to the Protestants side. Neither do I doubt but he disapproved several Superstitions in vogue amongst the *Greeks*, and laboured with all his power to reform them, according to the directions of his Conscience

science and Authority of his Charge. But to make him pass under pretence of this, for a half Calvinist, that was false to his own Principles, this is very disingenuously done. It is true he relates himself; that in a conference he held with *Fuxius*, a *Transylvanian* Doctor, touching the Invocation of Saints, *He acknowledged the difference betwixt having the Word of God for ones Rule, and following the Fancies and Opinions of men; the difference between building a man's Faith on the Foundation of Christ; and on Hay or Stubble.* *Hottinger in Appendix dissent. 8.*

BUT besides that, *Hottinger* from whom Mr. *Arnaud* has borrowed this particular; sets not down the time in which *Cyrillus* had this Conference with *Fuxius*, and that we must not suppose without good Proof, this hap'ned before his promotion to the Patriarchate of *Alexandria*; besides this, I say, it cannot be hence concluded, he wholly renounced in his heart the Invocation of Saints, nor that he respected it as an Impiety. *Hottinger* indeed calls this Worship Superstition, but from himself, and not from *Cyrillus*; so that it is not fairly done, to confound one man's Opinion with another. *Cyrillus* perhaps may have acknowledged in this Conference, that this Invocation, after the manner some teach and practise it, is a meer Fancy and humane Invention; that 'tis this Word, Hay, and Stubble, Saint *Paul* speaks of, and yet not absolutely rejected this Doctrine in the main. *Metrophanus Cretopolus* whom I already mentioned expressly distinguishes between an Invocation directed to Saints, as Mediatours, and that which respects them as Embassadors, whom the Church has near Almighty God to beseech him in behalf of their Brethren. He rejects the first, upon this Reason, that there is but one only Mediatour, who is Christ Jesus; but he receives the second; and *Cyrillus* himself; in the eighth Article of his Confession, insinuates this distinction, saying that our Saviour alone performs the Office of Chief Priest and Mediatour. It concerns me not now to examine, whether the distinction be good, or not, it is sufficient to say, that a man which holds it, may condemn the Invocation of Saints in one respect, and retain it in another, and remain in the Greek Church which practises it, without acting against his Conscience, and being a damnable Hypocrite, as Mr. *Arnaud* calls *Cyrillus*. *Confess. Eccl. Orient. cap. 17.*

WE may judge of the Sincerity of this Patriarch by his Confession, in which, and some Answers which accompany it, he clearly declared his Belief. It contains things which does not well agree with *Calvin's* Doctrine; as for instance, *That the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father by the Son, and that Baptism is absolutely necessary for our Communion with Christ*, which plainly shews Mr. *Arnaud* has been mistaken in affirming he was a Calvinist. We do not find he opposes any where Christ's Descent into Hell, nor the Hierarchical Order, nor regulated Fasts, Lents, Arbitrary use of Confession, Religious Orders, Monastick Vows, Celebration of Feasts, nor the use of the Greek Liturgy, nor any of those things commonly believed and practised in that Church, altho *Calvin* has for the most part disapproved of them. He admits the use of the Images of Jesus Christ, and the Saints, it's true he detests the giving them the Adoration of *Latria*, or any Religious Worship, *λατρείαν, ἢ προσκύνησιν*, and insinuates he was willing to correct the Superstition of the *Greeks* in this particular; he teaches likewise the Doctrine of Predestination, and Justification, according to the Word of God, more clearly than the Eastern People knew it. But it must not therefore be concluded, he was a Person that betrayed his Trust, in performing the Functions of the Patriarchate; nor that he was obliged to leave the external Communion of his Church, nor as speaks Mr. *Arnaud*, *That Piety could not subsist with so damnable Hypocrisie.* *Cyrl Conf. fides, art. 1. § art. 16.*

Matt. 7.

Rom. 14.

OUR Saviour and his Apostle taught us not to judge so rashly of the Consciences of men. *Fudge not, say's our Lord, that ye be not judged, for with what Fudgment you judge ye shall be judged, and with what measure you meet, it shall be measured to you again;* And the Apostle cries out to us, *Wilt thou that I judge another man's servant?* Certainly a man cannot be guilty of greater rashness than to condemn People from the Dictates of their own Conscience, when having never seen nor heard them, it is impossible to have any other than a confused and general knowledge of them, such as is Mr. Arnaud's touching *Cyrellus*. For besides that, a man may be easily mistaken, in imagining that such and such a sentiment obliges a man in conscience to the doing of this or th'other thing, if a man proceeds not to a particular consideration of Circumstances, besides this I say, it may be that this Obligation which appears to us so cogent and inviolable, has not so appeared to the Person concerned, which suffices to acquit him of the Crime of acting against his Conscience. Mr. Arnaud's censure cannot be justifiable, unless he could prove *Cyrellus* has really practised or approved the practice of things which he believed in his heart to be not only indifferent, or unprofitable, but absolutely evil, and that he has practised them in the same time when he judged them to be so. Now this Mr. Arnaud has not proved nor never will, he may make it appear that *Cyrellus* believed, we must not ground the hopes of our Salvation on humane Traditions, but the word of God, that we must invoke only Jesus Christ in the quality of Mediatour, and render no kind of Religious Worship to Images. He may prove that *Cyrellus* has found out the Errours in the Religion of the *Latins*, and Superstitions amongst the *Greeks*, and detested both. He may shew that *Cyrellus* has approved, conformably to his Confession, divers Points of the Doctrine of *Calvin*, but he cannot prove *Cyrellus* ever contradicted by his Actions any of these Sentiments, nor believed these Opinions obliged him to separate himself from the Communion of the *Greeks*, and forsake the Patriarchal Functions. His whole Conduct shewed on the contrary he believed 'twas his duty to labour at the establishment of perfect Piety in his Church, in opposing to the utmost of his power the progress of Error and Superstitions he condemned, and not leave a Flock which God had committed to his charge, and of which he was to render an Account. All which he did to the last breath. He held not the truth in unrighteousness, nor was he false to the Dictates of his Conscience. He published his Confession, and put it in the hands of all the *Greeks*, and maintained it before Kings and Princes in the presence of Ambassadors from Christian Monarchs, so that 'twas only passion that extorted this saying from Mr. Arnaud, *That he was a damnable Hypocrite*, and one that made his Faith buckle to his Interest.

Ib. 4 cap. 11.  
pag. 417.

'TIS the same Passion caus'd him to say, *That the advantageous Fudgment we make of this Person shews, that our Sect has no true Principle of Religion. That the Spirit which animates us, is rather a Spirit of Faction, and a Cabal against the Catholick Church, than a Spirit of Zeal for the establishment of true Piety.* God who is the Witness of our Innocency can be when he pleases the Protector of it. Our Interests are in his hands, and as we pray him to defend them, so likewise we beseech him to forgive Mr. Arnaud the Injury he does us. We appear extream odious in his sight, but when pleases God to inspire him with more equitable Sentiments, he will judge wholly otherwise. In this hope we will comfort our selves by the example of the Holy Apostles, and of our Saviour himself, *who were accused, say's Saint Chrysostom,*



to be seditious Persons and Innovators, that made it their business to disturb the Publick Peace. We will endeavour to refute these kind of Accusations by a Christian Deportment, without forgetting our Duty, is, to bless them that curse us, and pray for them that despitefully use us. *Chrysostom. Hom. 23 in Rom.*

ENGLAND and Holland are able to justify (were there occasion) the Actions of their Ambassadors in relation to the business of *Cyrrillus*, without my interposing. And as they were not the Masters nor Directors of his Conscience, so they were never able to prescribe him what he had to do; so that 'tis very unreasonable to make them responsible for his Conduct in those particulars. They have been no farther concerned in the Actions of this Patriarch, than this, that having known him in their Countries when he was there, their acquaintance was turned into mutual familiarity, when they found him at *Constantinople*. But this familiarity reached no farther than the usual Services, Persons of merit are wont mutually to render to one another, notwithstanding the difference of their Opinions in Religion. They helpt him to Books, and to the keeping a correspondence with Learned men. If Mr. *Arnaud* condemns this Commerce, and makes it a *Mystery of Iniquity*, *Pag. 422.* as he is pleased to call it, who need be troubled thereat? Strangers at *Constantinople* are not bound to give him an Account of their Friendships and Civilities. I do not doubt but these Ambassadors were glad to find this Patriarch's Confession to be so agreeable with several Doctrines which the Protestants believe to be of great Importance, and that he had no Inclination to a Union with the Church of *Rome*. Neither do I doubt but they consoled the Afflictions to which his Dignity and Virtues rendred him obnoxious, and would gladly have done him all the good offices in their power; and what is there unlawful in all this? Must *Cyrrillus* therefore be one of their Creatures, or govern himself according to their Directions? *Pag. 420.* Had they said, say's Mr. *Arnaud*, that they had obliged him to make a Declaration of his Faith agreeable to their Doctrine. Why would he have them acknowledge an untruth? Did ever any body see any thing more captious than to establish in the form of an Answer from our part a false Foundation to build thereon an Invective? Had they said, they had in fine obliged him. But should they say they obliged him not to this Confession, but that he made it according to the Dictates of his own Conscience and Knowledge? Now this is what they are without doubt ready to affirm, seeing 'tis the real truth. As to his being canonized amongst us for a Saint and Martyr (as Mr. *Arnaud* is pleased to affirm) he knows we have no such power. 'Tis certain (as I already mentioned) his memory is still precious amongst the *Greeks*, as that of a Saint and Martyr of Christ, as I shall make appear hereafter, but this is not to make him one of our Saints or Martyrs.

SHOULD we press those that judge thus of the Consciences of other men, perhaps they would be straitned to give us a reason for theirs, on the same Maxims, on which they would have that of this Patriarch's judged, and the Ambassadors of *England* and *Holland*. For not to go farther, how can they in conscience approve that their Scholars brought up in the Seminary at *Rome* (which were wholly their Creatures, sent into *Greece* to promote the Interest of the *Roman* See) should take Orders from Schismatical Bishops, and afterwards be raised to Bishopricks by Schismatical Patriarchs; that they should live in their communion and dependance in the midst of a Church in which the Pope and all the *Latins* are continually excommunicated on Holy Thursday by the Patriarch of *Jerusalem*; where their Sacrifice is abhorred, and

in Triod.

Thom. à Jezu  
de procuran.  
Salute omn.  
Gent. lib. 1. cap.  
4.

Allat. de  
Perp. Conf. lib.  
3. cap. 11.

Tab. 2. cap. 3.

Lib. 3. cap. 6,  
7.

Allat. de  
Perp. Conf. lib.  
3. cap. 11.

this Sentence read every Year in their Churches, *confounded be all they that offer unleavened Bread in the Sacrifice*, wherein Purgatory is rejected, and 'tis held a crime to say the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son, wherein the necessity of communicating under both kinds is held, carved Images condemned, and several other such like things which are not over favourable to the *Latins*. How in Conscience can these said Scholars be advanced to Patriarchates, elected, and consecrated by Schismatical Metropolitans, and placed at the Head of a Church which professes an open Separation from the Church of *Rome*, and live in Communion with that of *Jerusalem*, in which all the *Latins* in general are excommunicated? What I say, is grounded on matter of Fact, which Mr. *Arnaud* dares not deny, for should he do it, he would be convinced by the Testimony of *Thomas à Jezu*, who expressly tells us, *That it has been ever thought fitting, to permit the Schollars of the Seminary at Rome to take Orders, when in Greece, from the hands of Schismatical Bishops, it being necessary to use this Indulgence or Dispensation; to the end the Patriarchs may not scruple to promote them to Bishopricks; and likewise, that, they being Bishops, may provide the Churches in their Diocesses with Catholick Curats.* Let Mr. *Arnaud* tell us if he pleases, how they could in conscience advance *Cyrillus of Béroë*, to the Patriarchate of *Constantinople*, being a Disciple of the Jesuits, whom *Allatus* calls, *vir probus & Catholicus*, and who after his death was like to be canoniz'd, say's *Allatus*. The same Question may be put to him touching others, namely, *Timotheus, Anthimus, Gregory, Athenasius, Patelar*, who being all of 'em *Latins* in their hearts, yet for all that exercised the Patriarchal Functions in a Schismatical Church, wherein, as I said, the Pope and all the *Latins* are every year excommunicated. Moreover this Excommunication is not to be called in Question, forasmuch as Mr. *Arnaud* himself acknowledges it. *The Greek Patriarch of Jerusalem*; say's he, *excommunicates once a year on Holy Thursday, all other Sects, not excepting the Roman Church.*

HAVING satisfi'd the unjust Accusations of Mr. *Arnaud* against *Cyrillus* it now remains to see what advantage may accrue to us by this Patriarch's Confession, and whether the rejection he makes in express Terms of Transubstantiation, may be esteemed as that of the Body of the whole *Greek Church*. Mr. *Arnaud* tells us three things, on the discussion of which depends the Solution of this Question. The first, is, that, the *Greeks* continually endeavoured to deliver themselves from the Tyranny of *Cyrillus*, and that in effect he was four or five times expelled the Church. The second, that this Confession is wholly contrary in its principal Articles to the Doctrine of the *Greeks*. And the third, that it has been condemned by two Councils held by *Cyrillus* his Successors. Which is what we are now to examine.

AS to the first of these particulars, I confess this Patriarch has endured several cruel Traverses during his life, which never ended till they had procured his death, but I deny 'twas his Church occasioned him all these evils; It was the *Latine Party* and false *Greeks* which followed him with incessant Persecutions. How dexterous soever *Allatus* has been in disguising the Truth, yet could he not refrain here from discovering it: He tells us then, that the *Greeks* whom he calls *pui homines, zealous and pious People*, not being able to defend their Faith themselves, nor carry on the necessary expences for this, addressed themselves to other Christians, and especially to the *Roman Prelate*, by whose means they avoid the like Tempests, and secure their Church. He adds, there

there were Persons deputed towards *Cyrrillus*, with an exprefs charge, to oblige him either by *Promifes*, or *Threatnings*, to fend to *Rome* his Confession of Faith, in which he was to admit the Council of *Florence*, and condemn the Errors of the Calvinists, and in fo doing he might assure himself of the assistance and favour of the Apostolical See. That *Cyrrillus* answered, he liked well their offers, and was ready to accept their conditions, provided he might have money and be upheld in his Patriarchate. *But that at length finding he kept a correspondence both with Calvinists and Catholicks too, these last, being troubled thereat, proceeded to threatnings, saying, they would never suffer that Chair to be defiled with the Blasphemies of the Calvinists.* What he say's touching this Deputation is true, for the Congregation, *de fide propaganda*, sent two Jesuits to *Constantinople* with one, named *Canachio Rossi*, charged with Instructions to gain *Cyrrillus* by Promises or Threatnings, being required only to receive the Decrees of the *Florentine* Council. But what he adds concerning *Cyrrillus* his Answer, is a meer Calumny, for *Cyrrillus* remained immovable, notwithstanding all these Sollicitations. Neither, have we any reason to believe any thing upon *Allatus's* bare word. Mr. *Arnaud* may judge as he pleases, yet cannot he deny but *Cyrrillus* his Enemies, were the *Latins* and *Latinised Greeks*, and that the Tempests and Storms he suffered, and which at length overwhelmed him, came from that side, seeing, that *Allatus* himself (his own Witness and great Author) affirms it. *Cyrrillus* was ever beloved and honoured by his own true Church, as appears from the care and charge she was at to support him, and to say as Mr. *Arnaud* does, that the *Dutch* lent him money upon use, and that he extorted it afterwards from the Churches, which were made to obey him by the *Turks*, is a Story for which he brings no proof. Neither is there any likelihood particular Persons, who put their money out to use, should choose a man in his Circumstances, that is to say, one that was bereaved of his Dignities, and stript of all he had, were he (as it is supposed) the Object of his Peoples hatred. The *Dutch Merchants* at *Constantinople* are not wont to part with their money upon such Security. *Hottinger*, tells us, (from the Testimony of the deceased Mr. *Leger*, Minister of *Geneva*, who was at *Constantinople*, and had a particular Knowledge of this History) That one *Isaac*, Metropolitan of *Chalcedon*, a Disciple of the Jesuits, having bought of the *Turks* *Cyrrillus* his Seat, and the report of it being spread throughout *Constantinople*, there was such an Universal Lamentation amongst all the *Greeks*, that it came to the Grand Senior's Ears, who broke off this Intrigue, and would not suffer 'em to obey any longer this Usurper. He likewise produces a Letter from *Cyrrillus* his *Proto-Synellus*, that is to say, from one of the Chief Officers in his Chamber, named, *Nathanael Comopius*, dated from *Constantinople* the Fourth of *July*, 1638, Immediately after the death of *Cyrrillus*. Wherein he takes particular notice that the Executioners which strangled him, having parted his Garments among them, and afterwards carried them into one of the Markets of *Constantinople* to sell them, as being the Clothes of the late Patriarch, the People were universally seized with Grief, and uttered a thousand imprecations against *Cyrrillus* of *Berea*, calling him *Villain*, and *Murderer*, who had dishonoured God's Church, and not only usurped the Throne of the Holy and Lawful Patriarch, but likewise put him to death. He adds that some of 'em, entred the House of the Usurper, calling him *Pilate*, and bidding him give them the Body that they might bury it, and how they afterwards went to the *Caimacans*, and offered him a great deal of money to obtain of him the Body of their true Patriarch, but the wicked Usurper who caused him to be put to death, understanding it, sent to the *Caimacan* to tell him, that, if he gave these People *Cyrrillus* his Body,

*Hottinger. in  
Append Dis.  
ser. 8.*

Which Letter  
may be seen in  
its Original.

the



the City would certainly be in an uproar, which hindered him from granting them their request. In fine, he says, this Ufurper sent Slaves to take his Body, and cast it into the Sea, but that some Christians having taken it thence, carried it into a Monastery (called St. *Andrews*) where they privately buried it.

M R. *Arnaud*, will not fail to say, that *Hottinger* is a Minister, and one of the most passionate, and least sincere Writers, he ever read. But why must we rather believe *Allatius*, than *Hottinger*? The former of these has all the marks of a passionate man, who is ever upon disguising things, whereas this last on the contrary (let Mr. *Arnaud* say what he pleases) has all the Characters of a faithful Writer, relating things according to the best of his Knowledge. The former of these is I confess more polite, but th'other has more simplicity. *Allatius* relates from his own head, what he pleases, *Hottinger* alledges his Witnesses, and what likelihood is there Mr. *Leger* and *Canopius* whole Letter in its Original I have by me, invented these Stories thus circumstanced as we find them, if it were moreover true, that the Greek Church respected *Cyrellus* as a Heretick, and did her utmost endeavours to deliver her self from him. It was on the contrary the *Latins* and their Disciples who so strenuously endeavoured, to get rid of a Person whom they could neither gain by Promises, nor Threatnings, and that hindered them in their great Design of a Re-union. It was in reference to them, that *Cyrellus* added at the end of his Confession, *We plainly foresee, this short Confession, will be as a mark of contradiction to them, who are pleased to calumniate and persecute us.* His Presentiment was not vain.

Lib. 4. cap. 5.  
pag. 387 Con-  
fess. cap. 9.

Arcud. lib. 2.  
cap. 2.

A N D thus much touching Mr. *Arnaud's* first Objection. As to the second, which asserts the principal Articles of his Confession, are contrary to the Sentiment of the *Greeks*. I confess, there are some of them wherein the Doctrine of the Gospel is more plainly asserted than in other Greek Books, as the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Articles, for instance, which treat of our Justification by Faith in Christ, of Free Will and Divine Grace, but 'tis certain they do not in the main contradict the Doctrine of the Greek Church, and may be easily reconciled with the Answers of *Jeremias* to the Divines of *Wittenberg*. The Fifteenth Article, acknowledges but two Sacraments, and *Jeremias*, say's Mr. *Arnaud*, openly professes to hold seven. But I say the *Greeks* have no rule in this matter, *Metrophanus* acknowledges three of Divine Institution, to wit, Baptism, the Eucharist, and Penance, and as to the other four he affirms, *They are called Mysteries improperly* ὀνόματις. *Jeremias* acknowledges seven, 'tis true, but he reckons properly but two to be of Divine Institution, namely, Baptism, and the Lord's Supper; and as to the five others, he seems to acknowledge the Church has added them to the number of Sacraments. Wherefore will Mr. *Arnaud* needs have *Cyrellus* (who only speaks of the true Sacraments instituted by our Saviour, and not of humane Ceremonies, which are improperly called Mysteries, because they have something that is mysterious in them, as speaks *Metrophanus*) to have contradicted the Doctrine of the *Greeks*? Why (seeing he opposes *Jeremias* to *Cyrellus*) does he not sincerely relate the Sentiment of *Jeremias*? *Arcudius* has dealt better in this respect than he, for he acknowledges, *That Jeremias does not only teach that the Cream is a Sacrament of Tradition; but that he passes the same Judgment on all the rest, Baptism and the Lord's Supper excepted, contrary to what he had asserted in the Seventh Chapter of his first Answer.*

AS to the Eighteenth Article, in which *Cyrrillus* asserts, *That the Souls of the deceased, are carried immediately into a State of Bliss or Misery.* Mr. *Arnaud* Ibid. lib. 3. cap. 6 pag. 388. say's, he therein contradicts the general Opinion of the *Greeks*, touching the State of Souls after death. *Hornbeck*, and *Chytrens*, say's he, *And all that ever treated on the Opinions of the Greeks, affirm, they admit besides Paradise, and Hell, a certain dark, and doleful plate, in which the Souls are purged after this life.* I answer, the *Greeks* are not determinately positive, touching the State of the Soul after death. As to the Souls of the Faithful, there are some, who hold they will not enjoy the *Beatifick Vision*, till after the last Judgment, and in the mean time, are in pleasant and delightful places, places, exempt from all kind of sorrows, or else in dark and dismal shades, where they continually ruminate, on the sins they have committed, and these hold there are three different ranks of deceased Persons, namely, the Unfaithful or Wicked, the Faithful, that dye in a State of Repentance, and perfect Holyness, and others, who notwithstanding their Faith and true Piety, yet have committed several sins, for which they have not so truly repented, as they ought. Hell is designed for the first of these. The second, say they, go into places of rest and refreshment, and the last, into those doleful places, where they feel the want of God's favour and illumination.

BUT we must not imagine this to be the sense of the whole Greek Church, for there are not a few, that hold there are only two conditions of men after death, namely, that of the virtuous, and wicked, and two places, to wit, Heaven and Hell. *Syropulus*, relates in his History of the Council of *Florence*, that, the *Greeks* being urged by the *Latins*, to express themselves plainly touching the State of departed Souls; *Bessarion* declared, *That the Souls of the Saints, receive the Bliss prepared for them, and those of sinners, their punishments, and that it only remains, that each of these reassume their Bodies, after which, the Souls of the Just shall enter into a full enjoyment of Happiness with their Bodies, and that sinners likewise with their Bodies, &c. shall suffer everlasting punishments.* We see here but two States after death. We find in *Allatius* a passage of the *Greeks*, which likewise asserts but two places. *We must know, say's it, that the Souls of the Just remain in certain places, and those of sinners in like manner separate from them. Those rejoice upon the account of the hope of Bliss, These lament in expectation of their torments.* There is moreover a passage of *Joseph Briennius*, which asserts, *That, there are two places, designed for the entertainment of deceased Souls, Heaven for the Saints, and the Center of the Earth or Hell for sinners. That the Saints are at liberty, that they have all the World, and especially the Garden of Eden for their abode. That those who are condemned to Hell, will not come out from their abode, till the day of Judgment, and that they cannot receive the least beam of light or relaxation.* For, adds he, *the Saints will not enjoy eternal happiness, nor sinners suffer their everlasting torments, before the last Judgment. But these last shall be shut up in the mean time in dark Prisons, under the custody of cruel Devils.* *Sigismund*, speaking of the *Moscovits* say's, *They believe not there is any Purgatory, but hold, that every one after death goes to the place he deserves, good People into a place of Serenity amongst Angels, and the wicked into dismal and dark shades, amongst terrible Devils, where they expect the last Judgment; that the Souls of the faithful know they are in God's favour by the nature of the place they are in, and by the presence of Angels which accompany them, and so the others on the contrary.* *Goar* testifies that *Ligaridius* (a Greek Author of the Isle of Chios) expounding the meaning of those frequent *Alleluja's*, sung at the Funeral of *Eccl. disp. 3.*

*Hist. Concil. Flor. Sess. 5. cap. 16.*

*Allat. de lib. Eccl. disp. 3.*

*Ibid.*

*Sigism. Com. rer. Moscov.*

*Jacob. Goar in notis in offic. Exeq.*

Ec

the

the deceased, say's, *They are sung as sign of joy, that those who remain alive, may rejoyce, in that the defunct, has happily left this miserable life, and is now in possession of Everlasting Bliss.*

IT appears then by this diversity, that there is nothing so regulated, on this Subject, amongst the *Greeks*; but that *Cyrillus* may assert the Doctrine contained in the Article before us, without contradicting the general Belief of his Church. Besides, his Terms are not so strict, but that they may be well accommodated, with the Sentiment of those who affirm the Souls Enjoy not the *Beatifical Vision*, or a perfect Felicity, till the last Judgment, and that hold, there are three States of deceased Persons, for he say's only, *That the Souls of the deceased are in bliss or misery, and as soon as ever they leave their Bodies, are either in Heaven, or Hell*, which will bear this sence, that Judgment is already passed upon them, and that God has already shown them their condition, which hinders not, but it may be said that the damnation of the one is not yet perfect, and the felicity of the others not yet compleated. And this sence seems to be favoured by what *Cyrillus* adds immediately afterwards, *That every one is judged, according to the condition he is in at the hour of death*, which seems to intimate, that he would be understood to speak only of the Judgment, and not of the full and perfect execution of this Judgment. There are two things, most certain in reference to the *Greeks*, the one, that they pray for the dead, and th'other that they reject the Purgatory of the *Romane Church*. Now *Cyrillus*, touches not on the first of these, and as to the second, he agrees very well therein with his own People, for he calls Purgatory, *an imagination not to be admitted*. So that Mr. *Arnaud* impertinently accuses him of contradicting the *Greeks*, in the chief Articles of his Confession.

WE come now to Mr. *Arnaud*'s third Objection, which consists, of two pretended condemnations of *Cyrillus* his Confession, the one under *Cyrillus* of *Berrhaa*, and th'other under *Parthenius*. I have already discoursed of those two Pieces in my Answer to Father *Noüet*, wherein I have shewn they are suspected to be fictitious. But if the Reader will not trouble himself, with consulting what I have elsewhere written, touching the matter, he may here behold a *Compendium* of my Reasons.

I. ALTHO these Narratives have been often printed, there has been no body yet, that has taken upon 'em to own and warrant the Truth of them to the Publick. There is one of them printed from a Manuscript, sent from *Rome*, and th'other from an Edition printed at *Fasi* in *Moldavia* published by a certain Monk named *Arsenius*. It seems to me there ought to be greater assurance given than what we have already, seeing it is not sufficient to authorize so important a matter as the Determinations of two late Councils, the one in the year 1639. and th'other in 1642.

II. THESE two Narratives contradict one another, the first of them which is published under the name of *Cyrillus* of *Berrhaa*, is subscribed by several of those whose hands are to the second, and by the same *Parthenius*, to whom this last is attributed, and yet in the second there is no mention of the first. The first expressly anathematizes *Cyrillus*, and calls him an *impious and wicked Person*; The second, say's only, *There are certain Articles produced under the name of the Patriarch Cyrillus*. The first condemns with an *Anathema* these Articles. The second say's, *It was proposed in the Synod, whether they should*



*should be received and held for pious and orthodox Points, or rejected as being contrary to the Doctrine of the Eastern Church, which plainly shews that they that made the second, knew nothing of the first, and yet they are both found subscribed by the same Persons.*

III. THERE is no likelihood that *Metrophanus* the Patriarch of *Alexandria*, who is said to have been an Assessor at the first Synod under *Cyrrillus* of *Berrhaa*, nor that *Parthenius* who is said to have held the second, would have so lightly and fraudulently condemned *Cyrrillus Lucaris*, seeing one of 'em had been the Chief Officer of his Chamber, and th'other his Protector, and intimate Friend.

IV. *ARSENIUS* the Monk, from whom 'tis said we have the pretended account of the Synod under *Parthenius*, and who sent it from *Constantinople* to a nameless Friend at *Venice*, having stuffed his Letter with Railings against *Cyrrillus* and his Confession, yet mentions not a word touching its first condemnation under *Cyrrillus* of *Berrhaa*. Which shews us that these are counterfeit Pieces composed at several times, and by different Persons, who not consulting one another, nor furnished with sufficient Instructions, have been guilty of several Contradictions.

I will now add to what has been already said, some other Remarks, which are no less considerable, the first is that when *Cyrrillus* his Confession of Faith appeared in our Western Parts; the first Game that was played, was to deny it, and affirm 'twas a feigned Story; but when this Shift would no longer serve turn, and that the thing was made evident, then an account of these pretended Councils appeared, which shows that they were substituted as a new remedy, instead of the other, which could be of no longer use. Secondly, what *Parthenius* is made to say, *That there have been some Articles produced under Cyrrillus his name*, is as every man may discover the Style of the Western People, and not that of *Parthenius* himself, who could not speak after this manner; nor his Synod neither, because 'twas notorious in *Constantinople*, that this Confession was in effect *Cyrrillus* his own, seeing he offered it in a Council, and openly justified it before the Ministers of the Grand Senior, in the presence of several Ambassadors; and because *Parthenius* and his Bishops in the preceding Synod had already considered it, as unquestionably his. Moreover what likelihood is there, that *Parthenius* and his Council would thus grossly and slanderously imputed to *Cyrrillus* a thing that was false as they do? For *Cyrrillus* having said in the first Article of his Confession, *That the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father by the Son*, which is an expression from which the Greeks never vary; The first Article of the Censure bears, *That he asserted contrary to the sence of the Catholick Church the Substantial and Eternal Proceßion of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son*, which is exactly the expression the Greeks abhor.

WE may add to this, that Mr. *Arnaud* tells us of a Treatise of *Paysius Ligaridius* Archbishop of *Gaza*, in which, *Ligaridius* discourses of *Cyrrillus* and his Confession, and raises an Objection about it, which he himself answers, saying, *That several doubted of the truth of this Piece, and that should it be true, yet one Syallov does not make a Summer*; but he makes no mention of these two pretended Censures, which without doubt he would never have forgotten, being (as he is) a man full of Zeal for the interests of the Roman Religion, were they acknowledged to be good and Authentick Acts in the Greek

Church. I might say the same thing of the *Barons of Spartaris*, did it not elsewhere appear, that he was a Person of small Knowledge in the Affairs of the *Greeks*.

*Heydanius præfat. ad lib cui titulus est, causa Dei.* **HEYDANUS** (a Dutch Professor of Divinity) relates, that in the year 1643. The News being come to *Constantinople*, that, this pretended Council was confidently reported to be true in the West, *Parthenius* himself was so surprised and offended thereat, that assembling his Clergy and People in the Patriarchal Church, he openly professed 'twas false, and that he never intended such an injury to the memory of *Cyrillus*.

IN fine, Mr. *Rivet*, Doctor of Divinity, in *Holland*, writing to Mr. *Sarrau*, a Councillour in the Parliament of *Paris*, the 21. of *March*, 1644. tells him touching this Business, *That he saw (at Mr. Hagha's a Letter written in Vulgar Greek, from Pachomius, the Metropolitan of Chalcedon, which disowned the pretended Council under the Patriarch Parthenius. Farther affirming, that the Subscriptions were counterfeit, and particularly his. That this Piece was contrived by a Rascal, &c. That the Patriarch was a double minded man, yet denied what was printed in Moldavia to be the Act he signed; and that the Prince of Moldavia banished the Author of this Impression from his Territories.*

BUT, supposing what I now alledged, to be wholly untrue, and that these two pretended Councils, were as really true as I believe 'em to be false, yet is it certain, they will but confirm the Proof we draw from *Cyrillus* his Confession against Transubstantiation, and change it into Demonstration. Which will clearly appear, if we consider, that whosoever composed them, did all they could to turn *Cyrillus* his words into a fence odious to the *Greeks*, even to the imputing to him several Falsities; that *Cyrillus* of *Berrhaa* who presided in the first Council was a false *Greek*, and one of the Jesuits Scholars, engaged long since in the Party of the *Latins*, and that *Parthenius* seemed likewise fastned to the Roman Interest, if we take that for one of his Letters, which one *Athanasius* a Latinising *Greek* published, in which he makes him thus write to the late King, *That he heartily desired the Peace of the two Churches, as much as any of his Predecessors, but if the Turk, under whose Empire they lived, knew of this Affair, he would kill 'em all. Yet could the King find out a way whereby to secure them from this danger, he solemnly protests that for his part he would not be wanting.* So that we see here what kind of men the Authors of these two Censures have been, supposing 'em true, and yet they have not expressly censured what *Cyrillus Lucaris* asserted touching Transubstantiation; the first of these, to wit, *Cyrillus* of *Berrhaa* say's, *Anathematized be Cyrillus who teaches and believes that neither the Bread of the Altar, nor the Wine are changed, μὴ μεταβάλλεται, by the Priests Consecration, and coming down of the Holy Spirit, into the real Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, seeing 'tis written in the seventeenth Article of his Heretical Doctrine, that what we see and take is not the Body of Jesus Christ.* The second, namely, *Parthenius*, say's, *His Doctrine is so destructive to the Eucharist, that, he attributes only the bare Figure to it, as if we were still under the Old Law of Types and Shadows. For he denies the Bread which is seen and eaten, becomes after Consecration the real Body of Jesus Christ, in any other than a spiritual manner, or rather by imagination, which is the highest pitch of Impiety. For Jesus Christ did not say, This is the Figure of my Body, but this is my Body, this is my Blood, this, to wit, that which was seen, received, eaten, and broken after it was blessed and sanctified.* Not

*Athanas. Ephe-  
tor. Presbyt.  
Bisanti. anti  
pachlar. Paris  
1655.*

Not to take here notice, how captiously these People turn the Words of *Cyrillus*, to make them contradictory to the Belief, and common Expressions of the *Greeks*; it will be sufficient to observe, that howsoever prejudiced these Persons have been, they durst not re-establish the Transubstantiation he expressly condemned, nor take any notice of that part of the Article which rejects it in express Terms. But to the end we may better judge of this, it will not be amiss, to recite *Cyrillus* his own Words. *We believe, say's he, that the second Sacrament, which the Lord has instituted, is, that, which we call the Eucharist, for in the Night in which he was betrayed, taking Bread and blessing it, he said to his Apostles, take eat this is my Body; and taking the Cup, he gave thanks and said, drink ye all of this, this is my Blood which is shed for you; do this in remembrance of me. And Saint Paul adds, as often as ye shall eat of this Bread, and drink of this Cup, ye shew the Lord's death. This is the plain, true, and lawful Tradition, of this admirable Mystery, in the administration and understanding of which, we confess and believe a real, and certain Presence, of our Lord Jesus Christ, to wit, that which Faith offers and gives us, and not that which Transubstantiation has rashly invented and teaches. For we believe the faithful eat the Body of Jesus Christ in the Sacrament, not in a sensible chewing of him with the teeth, in the Communion, but in communicating by the sense of the Soul. For our Lord's Body is not in the Mystery, what our eyes behold, and what we take, but that which Faith (which receives after a spiritual manner) presents and gives us. Wherefore, it is certain if we believe, we eat, and participate; but if we believe not, we are deprived of this benefit. If you compare this Article with *Cyrillus* of *Berrhaa* and *Parthenius*'s Censures, you will find they apply themselves to that which is said concerning Our Saviour's Body being not what we see and eat, but that which our Faith does spiritually receive, and that they endeavour to give these Words a construction abominated by the *Greeks*; and different from their usual expressions. But as to what he says, touching Transubstantiation, (which he calls a rash invention, ἐπεφύρατο εὐχὴ μετασώσεως) we see they meddle not with that. They say that the Bread (μεταβάλλεται) is changed into the real Body of Jesus Christ, that 'tis not a Figure, but the real Body, but that it is so, by a real Conversion of Substance, they do not mention. I dispute not here concerning those Persons since that drew up these Censures; for I do not question but they were *Latins* in their hearts, and I further believe had they dared they would have proceeded farther; but any man may perceive they designed to accommodate themselves to the Style of the *Greeks*, the better to colour over their Forgeries. You see on one hand *Cyrillus*, who opposes Transubstantiation in plain Terms, boldly naming it, and giving it a Title sufficient to startle a Church that believed it, and on the other, we behold Persons interested to run down *Cyrillus*, and that leave no means unattempted whereby to render him odious to the *Greeks*, that poison all he says, and yet dare not defend this Transubstantiation, neither directly nor indirectly, neither in express Terms, nor equivalent ones. What means this Mystery, if the Greek Church does in effect believe the conversion of Substances? Could they light of a better occasion wherein to show their Zeal for Orthodoxy, and to confound at the same time *Cyrillus* his Accomplishes.*

M R. *Arnaud* tells us, That the Word *μετασώσεως*, is not the expression the *Greeks* commonly use for the explaining of Transubstantiation. But what does he mean by this? *μετασώσεως* signifies properly Syllable, after Syllable, Transubstantiation, the *Latins* use it when they express themselves in Greek, the Latinizing *Greeks* use it, and all the rest know what it signifies; supposing then it were not in common use amongst them, would they suffer a Person who

Lib. 4. cap. 6.  
pag. 387.



who pretends not to be a Grammarian, but a Divine, who speaks not of the Term, but of the thing meant by it, to reject it as stiffly as *Cyrillus* has done, without so much as saying, that altho we use not the Term of *μετεμορφωσις*, yet we believe the thing meant by it, to wit, the Conversion of Substances? Yet do they take no notice thereof, they forsake the Term and the thing represented by it, and contain themselves in their general expressions. Is not this then an evident token *Cyrillus* said nothing in this respect which opposed the Doctrine of his Church?

AND this is what we had to say touching this Patriarch. I am very much mistaken if any comparing this Chapter with the Third, which Mr. *Arnaud* has made on this Subject, will accuse me of rashness, for saying the real Doctrine of the *Greeks* appears in *Cyrillus* his Confession. For 'tis certain, that man who barely considers what I now mentioned touching *Cyrillus* his Confession, cannot but conclude the Greek Church believed not Transubstantiation. It only remains, for the finishing of this Chapter, that I speak something touching the State of this Church since the year 1642. the first time of the last of these pretended Censures. *Parthenius* having caused *Cyrillus* of *Berrhaa* to be banished, and afterwards strangled after the same manner as he served his Predecessor, he himself remained not long on the Throne. His bad Conduct, brought him down thence, and the Church of *Constantinople* substituted one, (who had been *Cyrillus Lucaris* his Disciple,) and named likewise *Parthenius* in his place. Which *Allatius* acknowledges in a Letter he wrote to *Nilhusius* dated in the year 1645. from whence we may judge, that this great aversion the *Greeks* shewed *Cyrillus* and those Synodical Censures are meer Forgeries: for what likelihood is there a Church, that used so many endeavours to deliver it self from such a man as *Cyrillus*, and which had anathematized his Memory and Doctrine, should four or five years after; put her self into the hands of one of his Disciples, and so run her self again into the same disorder and Heresie. Neither must Mr. *Arnaud* tell us that the *Turks* promote to this See, those that give them most money, and that a *Socinian* may as well arrive thereunto, as another; for this is not so absolutely true, but that the People have the liberty of hindring the Elections of Persons disagreeable to them, as appears by what *Allatius* relates concerning one *Meletius* Bishop of *Sophia*, who coming to *Rome*, in order to the reconciling himself with that Church, at his return into his own Country, was designed for the Patriarchate of *Constantinople*: But, say's he, he was put by, being hindered by the People. We see then this People, have still the liberty to reject the Latinising *Greeks*, and that they do in effect put them by; but we find not they made the least attempt to hinder the Election of *Cyrillus* his Disciple, whom the *Latins* term a Heretick and Calvinist, as well as his Master.

*Allat. de per.  
Conf. lib. 3.*

*Lib. 4. cap. 7.  
pag 39. 392.*

*Allat. de Per-  
pet. Conf. lib 3  
cap. 11.*

*Allat. ubi su-  
pra.*

THIS condition wherein we now beheld the Greek Church lasted from the year 1645. till 1653. Observe here what Doctour *Basire*, a Reverend Divine of the Church of *England*, whom I have already mentioned wrote to me about it. *When I was at Constantinople, which was in the year 1653. Paysius was then Patriarch of it, who in token of Communion with the Church of England, laid his hands on me in an Assembly of Bishops, according to custom, as being a Priest of the Church of England, and with this imposition of hands gave me power to preach in Greek in all the Greek Churches within his Jurisdiction. Which I afterwards did very often, according as occasion offered, as well at Constantinople as elsewhere, altho the Jesuits seemed to be very much displeased thereat: I preached one Sunday to the English, another in French for the*

the Genevoises, the next Sunday to the Italians, the following Sunday in Latin to the Hungarian and Transylvanian Ambassadors, and the fifth Sunday in Greek in the Greek Churches. Now what likelihood is there, if Cyrillus his Doctrine were so odious, and his Memory so execrable to the Greeks, (as Mr. Arnaud would persuade us) and their Opinion touching the *Eucharist* the same with theirs in the Church of Rome; and if they detested our Doctrine as impious and Heretical, they would admit a Minister of the Church of England, to be a preacher amongst them, and not be afraid that in preaching to 'em the Gospel, he should instil amongst them the pretended Errors of his Nation, especially in that important Subject of the *Eucharist*?

## CHAP. XIII.

*The Real Belief of the Greeks, touching the Eucharist.*

**B**UT what do the *Greeks* then believe, if they believe not Transubstantiation? The Bounds of this Controversie oblige me not to answer this Question. For it concerning us here only to inquire, whether the *Greeks* do, or do not believe the Conversion of Substances, it is sufficient that we show they do not believe it, seeing as I have already said, we pretend not, that their Faith must be the rule of ours; yet will I endeavour to satisfy the Reader in this particular. I do also hope, that this inquiry will not be useless towards the clearing up of the principal Question, between Mr. Arnaud and my self, because that in shewing what the *Greeks* do believe, I do at the same time shew what they do not believe. I shall do then three things in this Chapter, the first of which shall be to shew the real Belief of the *Greeks* touching the Eucharist; Secondly, describe in what they agree, and differ from the Church of Rome. And thirdly, likewise, wherein we of the Reformed Church do agree with them, and in what particulars we do not.

AS to the first of these Points, to the end we may have a fuller and clearer understanding of the real Opinion of the *Greeks*, it will be necessary we make several Articles of it, and reduce them into these following Propositions.

**FIRST**, in general, the *Eucharist* is, according to them, a mystical representation of the whole Oeconomy of Jesus Christ. They express by it his coming into the World, his being born of a Virgin, his Sufferings, Death, Resurrection, Ascension into Heaven, and the Glory he displayed on the Earth in making himself known and adored by every Creature. Were it necessary to prove this Proposition, we could easily do it, by the Greek Liturgies, and Testimonies of *Cabasilas*, *Germain*, *Simeon Thessalonienensis*, *Jeremias*, and several others; but this not being a matter of contest, I shall not insist upon it.

**SECONDLY**, They consider the Bread in two distinct respects, either whilst it is as yet on the Table of the *Prothesis*, or on the great Altar. Whilst 'tis on the *Prothesis*, they hold 'tis a Type or Figure. Yet do they sometimes

sometimes call it the Body of Jesus Christ, sometimes, the imperfect Body of Christ, sometimes the dead Body of Jesus Christ, although they do not believe the Consecration is then compleated. This is confirmed by what I related in the Fourth Chapter of this Third Book, and it is not likewise necessary to insist any longer thereon, because this particular concerns not the matter in hand.

**T H I R D L Y**, When the Symbols are carried and placed on the great Altar, they say that by the Prayers of the Priest, and Descent of the Holy Spirit, the Bread and Wine, are perfectly consecrated and changed into the Body and Blood of Christ. To express this change, they use these general Terms I already noted, to wit, μεταβολή, μεταποίησις, μετασχηματισμός, &c. which signifie a change. They say the Bread is the Body of Christ, and that it is made the very Body itself, or the proper Body of Christ, and hereunto refer all those Citations Mr. Arnaud has alledged out of Theophylact, Euthymius, Nicholas Methoniensis, Cabasilas, Simeon Thessalonienensis and Jeremias. We do not deny that the Greeks use these Expressions, it concerns us here only to know in what sense the Greek Church uses them, and what kind of change they mean thereby.

Bibl. Patr.  
Tom. 2. Græco-  
Lat.

Nicetas Choni-  
as. Annal.  
lib. 3.

Jean Sylv. a-  
trebat. Cathem.

Confess. Eccles.  
Or. cap. 9.

Allat. adver-  
sus Chreygton  
exercit. 22.

I say then, that when we come to examine this change, and determine in what manner the Bread and Wine, are made the Body and Blood of Christ, they curb our curiosity, and remit this knowledge and determination to God, and for their own parts keep within their general Terms. Which appears by the profession of Faith which the Sarrazins made in the Twelfth Century, when they imbraced the Greek Religion; I believe, say's the Profelyte, and confess the Bread and Wine which are mystically sacrificed by the Christians, and of which they partake in their Divine Sacraments. I believe likewise that this Bread and Wine, are in truth the Body and Blood of Christ, being changed intellectually and invisibly by his Divine Power above all natural conception, he alone knowing the manner of it. And upon this account it was, that Nicetas Choniatus complains, that in the Twelfth Century the Doctrine of the Divine Mysteries was divulged, and therefore censures the Patriarch Camaterus for his not having immediately silenced a Monk, who proposed this Question (to wit) whether we receive in the Eucharist the corruptible or incorruptible Body of Jesus Christ. He should have been condemned, say's he, for an Heretick that introduced Novelties, all the rest silenced by his example, to the end the Mystery may ever remain a Mystery. Fohn Sylvius in his Cathemerinon of the Greeks recites a Prayer, wherein it is said, That the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ are touched, and changed on the Altar, after a supernatural manner, which must not be inquired into. We have likewise already seen in the Tenth Chapter of this Book the Testimony of Metrophanus, the Patriarch of Alexandria, who having told us the consecrated Bread is really the Body of Jesus Christ, and that which is in the Cup undoubtedly his Blood, he adds, That the manner of this change is unknown to us, and the knowledge thereof reserved for the Elect in Heaven, to the end we may obtain more favour from God by a simple Faith void of curiosity. And thus acquits himself.

**A N O T H E R** Greek Author, cited by Allatius, under the name of Fohn the Patriarch of Jerusalem. You see, say's he, that Saint Paul scruples not to call this Body Bread. But be it so if you will, that it be no longer called Bread, and being no longer Bread is neither leavened nor unleavened, you see that it is not bereaved of these Appellations till after Sanctification. But before this dread-  
ful



*ful Sacrifice, when you offer it to sanctify it, shall this be neither Bread nor an Azyme? Now that which is done in this Oblation is by our selves; but that which happens in this admirable change, is not from us but God. It appears by this passage recited by Allatus, and taken if I be not deceived out of a Manuscript, wherein this Author disputes touching the Azymes against a Latin who told him, that this Controversie was vain, seeing that after the Consecration, it is no longer Bread, but the Body of Jesus Christ, and it seems this Patriarch maintains against him, that 'twas still Bread, and proves it by the Authority of Saint Paul, who so calls it. It seems likewise by what he adds, that he would say, that supposing it was no longer called Bread, and lost this name, yet we must not speak of what it becomes by Consecration, because God only knows that, and not men.*

ALTHO the *Greeks* are sometimes thus reserved, restraining themselves within their general Terms, yet for the most part they shew more particularly their thoughts, touching the nature, and kind of the change which happens to the Bread and Wine, and which makes them to be the Body and Blood of Christ: And they do it likewise in such a manner, that 'tis no hard matter to find out their meaning: Which is what we have now to demonstrate. But before we enter into this Deduction, it will not be amiss to observe, that the Bread and wine may be conceived to be changed into the Body and Blood of Christ two ways. First, by a real conversion of the whole Substance of Bread and Wine, into the Substance of the Body and Blood, I mean into the same numerical Substance (as the Schools speak) so that the Substance of Bread subsists no longer after the change, which is what is held in the Roman Church. Secondly, by the addition of a new quality, or form in the Bread and Wine, so that their first Substance remaining, they receive that which they had not before, and by this reception become that which they were not. In this first manner of conceiving the change, the Substance of Bread, and that of the Body are considered as two Terms, or two different Subjects, the first of which does not subsist, but passes over into the other. In the second, the Bread is considered as a Subject that always subsists, but which receiving into it that which it had not, by this means becomes the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, after the same manner as the paper which receives the Characters and Seal of a Prince, becomes the Princes Letter, or Wax receiving the Impression of a Seal, is made the Seal it self, or Wool dyed in Scarlet, becomes a scarlet colour, or Wood receiving the impression of fire, becomes fire it self, or in fine, as the nourishment we take, receiving the form of our Flesh, and being joyned thereunto, becomes our Body. By which it appears that to proceed faithfully, and ingenuously, in our Inquiries after the real Belief of the *Greeks* it must first be acknowledged, that these expressions; *The Bread is changed into the Body of Jesus Christ, the Bread is made the Body of Christ, the Bread is the Body it self, or the proper Body of Jesus Christ*, are in themselves general expressions, and that they may be simply taken in this their generality, or applied to several particular, senses. Now if Mr. *Arnaud* would have us take these expressions in the sense of Transubstantiation, he must produce some solid and real passages out of Greek Authors, by which it may appear that 'tis in this sense they understood them, and that they cannot admit of any other. Which is no more than what he ought to have done, but he has been far from undertaking it, knowing it to be a thing absolutely impossible.

AS to my own part, had I only intended to shew the insufficiency of Mr.

F f

*Arnaud's*

*Arnaud's* Proofs, I might content my self with alledging this generality, for it alone is sufficient to hinder him from drawing any Conclusion. But seeing I have taken upon me, to shew in this Chapter, what the real Sentiment of the Greek Church is, I find my self obliged to bring, not Arguments, or Distinctions from my own Head, but good and solid passages of the *Greek* themselves; which plainly demonstrate what kind of change they mean.

FOR this effect I shall reduce what they say concerning it, to this Proposition; They believe that by the Consecration there is made a kind of composition or mixture of Bread and Wine, and Holy Spirit; that these Symbols keeping their own proper nature, are joyned to the Divinity, and by the impression they receive from the Holy Ghost, are changed (for the Faithful only) into the virtue of the Body and Blood of Christ, being made by this means not a Figure, but the proper, and real Body of Jesus Christ, and this by way of Augmentation of the same natural Body of Jesus Christ. To which they apply the Comparisons I already mentioned, concerning the nourishment which becomes our proper Body by Assimilation and Augmentation, of the Wood which is put to the Fire, of the Wool which receives the dye, of Paper that is made the Princes Letter, and Wax, or other Matter which receives the Impression of the Seal.

This Proposition having several parts, and each of them of great importance in this Question, it is therefore necessary to establish them one after another distinctly and solidly.

FIRST, They believe there is a composition or mixture made of the Bread with the Holy Spirit. *Metropolitanus* the Patriarch of *Alexandria*, shews us, that this is their Doctrine. For observe here what he say's in his Confession of Faith of the Eastern Church in his Chapter of the Sacraments, God, say's he, *has communicated his Grace to the Elect, not only after a spiritual manner, but likewise by some sensible signs, as most certain pledges of his promise. For as we are composed of two parts, so likewise the manner of communicating his Grace must be double, to wit, by a sensible matter, and by the Holy Spirit, seeing the Persons that receive these things are made up of a sensible Body and intelligent Soul; Now these Pledges are that which we call the Mysteries, to wit, 'Baptism and the Holy Communion, which consist of visible Matter, and of the Holy Spirit. These Words are so plain, that they need no Comment. He affirms there are two things in the Sacraments, and particularly in the Eucharist, to wit, the sensible Matter, and the Holy Spirit. Now the sensible Matter in the Eucharist can be nothing else but the Bread and the Wine.*

*Confes. Eccles.  
Or. cap. 5.*

*Ibid cap. 9.*

*METROPHANUS*, affirms moreover the same thing in his Chapter, touching the Lord's Supper, wherein he say's, *that the Mystery never loses the Sanctification it has once received, and that it is indelible. It is here where he compares the Sanctification the Bread receives, to Wool when 'tis dyed in any colour, which includes apparently this Idea of the Composition of Bread, and the Holy Spirit almost after the same manner as Wool that is dyed is a composition or mixture of Wool and dye.*

*Jerem. Rep. 1.  
ad Theologos  
Wittenb.*

THIS Greek Patriarch has only followed in this, the Doctrine of *Ferebas* the Patriarch of *Constantinople* in his Answer to the Divines of *Wittenberg*, Consisting, say's he, *as we do of two Parts, that is to say, of a Body and a Soul, our Saviour Christ has therefore given us these things doubly, (he means the Sacraments) he himself consisting of two Natures, being both God and Man*

*He*

*He spiritually sanctifies our Souls by the Grace of his Spirit, and sanctifies likewise our Bodies by sensible Matters, namely, with Oyl, Water, Bread and Wine, and other things sanctified by the Holy Spirit, and thus gives us a compleat Salvation. He not only say's, that the Sacraments in general are things that are double (as he terms them) consisting of things sensible, and the Holy Spirit, but say's, this particularly of the Bread and Wine in the Eucharist.*

WITH this agrees the expressions of the Greek Liturgies, and those of the most famous Authors of this Church, who call the Sacrament *the Holy Bread, the Consecrated Bread, the Divine Bread, the Gifts sanctified by the Holy Spirit*, for these Expressions do naturally denote that composition or duplicity aforementioned.

NOW if we would know how it has come to pass, the *Greeks* of latter Ages have thus expressed themselves in relation to this part of their Belief, we need only look back to the foregoing Ages, for we shall there find Sentiments and Expressions on the same Subject, if not wholly conformable to the Expressions of the *Modern Greeks*, yet which come very near them, and which have served for a Foundation to 'em, as will appear by the following Passages.

WE may then here mark what the *Fathers* of the Council of *Constantinople* in the Eighth Century asserted. *As the Body of Jesus Christ is Holy, because 'tis deified, so likewise, that which is his Body by Institution, to wit, his Holy Image is made Divine, by a Sanctification of Grace. For as by virtue of the Hypostatical Union, our Saviour deified the Flesh he took on him, by a Sanctification naturally proper to him, so in like manner he will have the Bread in the Eucharist (which is the real Image of his Flesh) to become a Divine Body by the Descent of the Holy Spirit into it, the Oblation being, by means of the Priest, transferred from a common State, to a State of Holiness. And therefore the natural Flesh of Jesus Christ endued with Soul and Understanding, has been anointed by the Holy Spirit, being united to the Divinity, and so likewise his Image, to wit, the Divine Bread, is filled with the Holy Spirit. Who sees not in these words the Union, and Composition of Bread with the Holy Spirit? The Bread, say they, is made Divine by a Sanctification of Grace, it becomes a Divine Body by the Descent of the Holy Spirit into it; the Bread is filled with the Holy Spirit, in like manner as the natural Flesh of our Lord has been sanctified, deified, and anointed with the Holy Spirit, by virtue of the Hypostatical Union. All this plainly favours the Composition of the Modern Greeks. Now this Testimony is the more considerable, in that the second *Nicene Council* having been held on purpose to overthrow whatsoever had been determined in that of *Constantinople*, touching the Point of Images, they censured the name of *Image*, which their Adversaries had given the *Eucharist*, but left untouched the other Clauses, I now mentioned. Which shews that these kind of Expressions, were received by both Parties, and that this was the common Doctrine of the whole Greek Church.*

*In actis Concil.  
Nic. 2. aB. 6.*

IN effect if we ascend higher, we shall find, that Saint *Ephraim* Bishop of *Antioch*, who lived about the Sixth Century, thus expressed himself, *That the Body of Jesus Christ, which the faithful receive, does not leave its sensible Substance, nor is separated from the spiritual Grace. Which does moreover favour the Duplicity, or Composition of Bread with the Holy Spirit.*

*Apud Phot.  
Bib. Cod. 229.*



*Diog. al. 1.* **THEODORET**, who lived about the Fifth Century, expresses himself after the same manner. *Jesus Christ*, say's he, *has honoured the visible Symbols with the name of his Body and Blood, not in changing their nature, but in joyning his Grace thereunto.* *Chrysostom* said the same thing in the Fourth Century, *That the Bread becomes Heavenly Bread, by means of the Holy Spirit's coming down upon it.*

*Theophil. Alex. Ep. Pasch. 1. Bibl. Patr. Tom. 3. Edit. 4.* **THEOPHILUS** of Alexandria in the same Century wrote, *That the Bread and Wine placed on the Lord's Table are inanimate things, which are sanctified by Prayer, and Descension of the Holy Ghost.*

*Irenæ. advers. Hæres. lib. 4. cap. 34.* **SAINT Irenæus** who lived in the Second Century; spake to the same purpose, *That the Eucharist consists of two things; the one Earthly, th' other Heavenly.* It is plain by the sequel of his Discourse, that he means by these two things the Bread, and sanctifying Grace of the Holy Spirit. But it is also manifest, that all these Passages have occasioned the Belief of the *Composition*.

*Thom. à Fes. lib. de procur. salute omn. gent. part. 2. lib. 7. cap. 7.* **THOMAS** a Fes. tells us of an Errour wherewith almost all the Eastern Christians are infected: which is; *That Jesus Christ soaked the Bread he was to give to Judas, that he might thereby take away its Consecration.* I confess 'tis a great absurdity to imagine the Consecration can be taken away by this means; but 'tis easie to perceive, these ignorant People have fallen into this Errour, by conceiving the Consecration under the *Idea* of a real impression made on the Substance of Bread, for thereupon they have imagined this impression might be effaced in washing the Bread, or soaking it.

**A N D** thus far concerning the first part of my Proposition. The second, is, *That they believe the Bread and Wine keeping their proper nature are joyned to the Divinity.* Which is the same thing as the first, only, otherwise expressed. They will then mutually assist and strengthen each other. For this effect I shall produce the Testimony of *Nicholas Methoniensis*, who lived in the Twelfth Century. This Author in answering those that doubted whether the *Eucharist* was the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, because they saw neither Flesh nor Blood, but Bread and Wine, resolves the difficulty in this manner. *God*, say's he, *who knows all things, and is perfectly good, has wisely ordered this in respect of our weakness, lest we should have in horror the Pledges of Eternal Life, being not able to behold Flesh and Blood, he has therefore appointed this to be done by things, to which our nature is accustomed, and has joyned to them his Divinity, saying, this is my Body, this is my Blood.*

*Nicolaus Methon. advers. dubitantes, &c. Bibl. Patr. Græco-Lat. Tom. 2.* **M R. Arnaud** pretends to make advantage of these Doubts, which *Nicholas Methoniensis* treats of, but we shall answer this Point in its due place. It suffices at present that we behold this Author laying down on one hand, *the things to which our natures are accustomed, that is to say, Bread and Wine, and on the other, he assures us, that the Divinity is joyned to them.* Which is exactly what I was to prove, whence it follows, that according to the *Greeks*, the Bread and Wine remain in Union with the Divinity. *Mr. Arnaud* who saw the force of this Passage, has endeavoured to avoid it by a frivolous evasion. *God joyns*, say's he, *his Divinity to the Bread and Wine.* 'Tis true, but he has joyned it as the efficacious cause of the change of the Bread and Wine into the Body and Blood of Christ, so often repeated, by *Nicholas Methoniensis*, but not

*Lib. 2 cap. 13. pag. 231.*

not as a means of Union between the Bread and Wine, and Body of Jesus Christ. He has joyned it to the Bread, not to conserve it in the Substance of Bread, but to transform it internally into his Body.

I say this is a frivolous evasion. For according to this reckoning we must understand by the things familiar to our natures, the Bread and Wine, as the matter to which the Divinity is joyned to change it. But were this the sense of *Nicholas Methoniensis*, what would this contribute to the clearing up the doubt proposed to him? The Question is, *whether the Flesh and Blood would not appear, if they were in the Sacrament*, and *Nicholas Methoniensis* answers, that the Bread and Wine are the matter changed by the Divinity, which effects this change. This is certainly a very strange way of speaking, to say, he joyns his Divinity to them, to signify that he transubstantiates them. We see few People thus express themselves. But supposing this, what relation has this to the Doubt he pretends to resolve? If the Flesh of Christ were in the Sacrament, say these Dubitants, it would appear, we should see it. I answer, say *Nicholas Methoniensis*, (according to Mr. *Arnaud's* Comment) that the Bread and Wine are the matter which is changed, and that the Almighty power of God changes them. Can any Answer be more ridiculous? This Author must certainly lost his Wits to make such a Reply. They do not ask him, what the matter is that is changed, nor what the efficient cause of this change, but, why, if it be the Body of Christ, it does not appear to be Flesh, but Bread; Matter, Cause, efficacy contribute nothing to the solving of this Doubt. This Gloss then of Mr. *Arnaud's* is absurd, and if we suppose *Nicholas Methoniensis* spake sense, it must be granted, that his meaning is, that the Bread and Wine, remaining Bread and Wine, are yet notwithstanding made the Body and Blood of Christ, by reason of their Union to the Divinity, and not otherwise. Whence it follows, that it must not be expected they should appear to be Flesh and Blood, because they are not so in respect of their Matter, or Substance, but only by their Union to the Divinity, which makes them in some sort to be the same thing, with the Body and Blood.

THIS Opinion seems to be derived from *Damascen*, whose expressions I desire I may have leave to mention, altho we must use them also in another place. For 'tis certain, that to judge aright of the Opinion of the Modern Greeks, we must ascend so far. Mr. *Arnaud* has himself observed, that, *Fohn Damascen is another Saint Thomas amongst the Greeks*, and has been ever the rule of their Doctrine touching the *Eucharist*. Elsewhere he assures us, *That we need only read the Treatises of the Modern Greeks, to find that they wholly conform themselves to the Sentiment and Expressions of this Father*. This then is a Principle with Mr. *Arnaud*, so that to convince him touching the Belief of the *Greeks*, there is a kind of necessity lying upon us to consult this Father.

Lib. 2. cap. 5.  
pag. 155.  
Lib. 2. cap. 12.

OBSERVE here then what he say's in his Fourth Book of the Orthodox Faith, *The Bread and Wine are not the Figure of the Body and Blood of Christ; God forbid; but they are the deified Body it self of Jesus Christ, the Lord himself saying unto us, this is, not the Figure of my Body, but my Body, nor the Figure of my Blood, but my Blood: He had said before to the Jews, if ye eat not the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his Blood, you will have no life in you, for my Flesh is Meat indeed, and my Blood is Drink indeed. And then again, He that eateth me shall live. Draw we near then with trembling,*

*Damascen de  
Orthod. fid.  
lib. 4. cap. 14.*

with

with a pure Conscience, a firm Faith, and it will be unto us according to the constancy and firmness of our Faith. Honour we it with a perfect purity of Body and Soul. For it is double. Approach we towards it with a fervent desire, and placing our hands in manner of a Cross, receive we the Body of him that was crucified for us. Let us put it on our Eyes, Lips, and Forehead, and take we thus the Divine Coal, to the end our Devotion being inflamed thereby, our sins may be consumed, and our hearts inlightned, and that by the participation of this Divine Fire, we may our selves become inflamed and deified. *Esaïas* saw a Coal. Now a Coal is not meer Wood, but Wood in conjunction with Fire. So the Bread of the Communion is not mere Bread, being it is united to the Divinity. Now a Body united to the Divinity is not one single nature, but two, one being that of the Body, and th'other that of the Divinity annexed thereunto. So that to take them together, it is not one only nature, but two.

THESE Words clearly shew, that *Damascen* means, that the Bread in the *Eucharist*, which is the Body of *Jesus Christ*, is double, because 'tis joyned to the Divinity, that 'tis not mere Bread, but Bread united to the Divinity, consisting of two natures, one of Bread, and th'other of the Divinity which is joyned to it; in like manner as *Esaïas* his live Coal was not meer Wood, but Wood in conjunction with Fire. Now this is what is exactly contained in my Proposition, that the Bread, and Wine keeping their proper nature are joyned to the Divinity, according to the *Greeks*.

MR. *Arnaud*, who saw the force of this Passage, that he might get clear off it, has bethought himself, to say, that the Duplicity which *Damascen* mentions must be understood as meant of *Jesus Christ* himself, who consists of two Natures. He rehearſes the Passage in hand to these Words, *Duplex est enim*, and then adds, it is plain that hitherto these Words relate to *Jesus Christ*, and his true and real Flesh, and that 'tis of him it is said, *Duplex est enim*, which is to say, that he is composed of two Natures, and a little farther, It plainly appears that *Saint John Damascen's* Design is to exhort us to a double purity of Soul and Body, to honour the double Nature of *Jesus Christ*, and to show that we receive in the Communion this double Nature. So that these Words, *non est panis simplex sed unitus divinitati, corpus autem unitum divinitati non est una natura sed dua, una quidem corporis altera conjuncta Divinitatis*, are the Exposition of what he said before, that *Jesus Christ* was double. And that which he shews us, is, that this double nature of *Jesus Christ* has been signified by the Coal which *Esaïas* saw, and that we receive this Divine Coal.

Lib. 7. cap. 4.  
pag. 654.

Ibid.

Vide *Damascen de Orthodoxa Fide*, of *Veronnes* Impression, 1531. and that of *Basil*.

BUT all this is but an Errour, and cunning Evasion of Mr. *Arnaud*, who was not willing to consult the Greek Copy of *Damascen*, for 'tis true indeed these Latin Words, *Duplex est enim*, may refer to *Jesus Christ*, or his Flesh, because the Latin word, *Duplex*, is of all Genders, so that being taken in the Masculine it relates to *Christ* himself, and in the Feminine to his Flesh. But had Mr. *Arnaud* been willing to consult the Greek Text, he would have found no pretence for this evasion. For there is διπλῶν ὃ ἐστίν. Now who knows not, that διπλῶν, is of the Neuter Gender, which by consequence can neither agree with *Jesus Christ*, nor his Flesh, but with σῶμα, the Body which the Bread is, and which we receive in the Communion, of which he spake in the beginning of his Discourse? He might have found also that these words, Honour we him, are in the Greek in the Neuter Gender, τιμῶμεν ὃ αὐτὸ πᾶσι καὶ δεξιῶν, which can only refer to the Body, and not to *Jesus Christ*, nor his Flesh.

MR.



MR. Arnaud methinks should take more care another time of what he writes, and not give us so many of his; *It is clear, it manifestly appears, for there is nothing so clear as the contrary of what he say's.* Damascen speaking of the Bread of the Communion, say's, that 'tis not a Figure, but the deified Body of Jesus Christ, he would have us honour this Body, that is to say, that Body which we receive in the Communion, with a double purity of Body and Soul, externally and internally, because 'tis double. He shews what ought to be our inward disposition, to wit, a fervent desire, he passes to our external Actions, which are, to hold our arms cross-wise, and to hold the Communion we receive on our Eyes, Lips, and Forehead. Afterwards, to explain how this Body is double, he compares it to the Coal *Esaïas* saw, which was not bare wood, but wood and fire together. Then applying immediately his comparison, he adds, *Thus the Bread of the Communion is not mere Bread, being it is united to the Divinity.* Now a Body united to the Divinity, is not one single nature, but two, one of the Body, and th'other of the Divinity, which is joyned thereunto. Who sees not then, that this double Body, of which he speaks, and which he compared to *Esaïas* Coal, is the Bread of the Communion, that it is double, being Bread united to the Divinity, and that the effect of this Union is, not to change the nature of the Bread, but to make a composition of two Natures. Whence it manifestly follows, that one of these Natures being the Divinity, th'other is the nature of Bread. It is then true, as Mr. Arnaud has observed, that these last words, *Sic panis communionis non est panis simplex sed unitus divinitati*, are the exposition of what he said before, *Duplex est enim, for it is double.* But because *duplex* refers not to Jesus Christ, but to the Body we receive in the Communion; it is therefore likewise true, that they expound what we must understand by this Body, to wit, the Bread united to the Divinity.

BUT I must pursue the other parts of my Proposition. The Greeks believe, *That by the impression which the Bread and Wine receive from the Holy Spirit, they are changed into the virtue of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, and made by this means this Body and Blood.* Which is apparent, first, from all those Passages of the Liturgies I mentioned in the Fifth Chapter of this Book; the result whereof, is, that the Bread becomes the Body of Jesus Christ, inasmuch as 'tis made capable of sanctifying us, and that this is exactly what the Priest prays for in the words of Consecration. Now what is this, but the Bread's being made the Body of Jesus Christ in virtue?

SECONDLY, This appears likewise by what we have seen from *Si-meon Thessalonienfis*, who tells us, that the unconsecrated Particles being mixed with those that are consecrated, and partaking of their Sanctification, become in some sort, the Body of Christ, and are proper for the Communion of the Faithful. For this necessarily supposes, as I shewed in the Fifth Chapter, of this Third Book, that the consecrated Particle it self is the Body of Jesus Christ, inasmuch as it receives this Sanctification.

THIRDLY, This moreover appears by the Passages of *Cabasilas*, which I alledged in the Sixth Chapter, by which we see that he takes for the same thing, to receive Sanctification, and to receive the Body of Jesus Christ. Which likewise necessarily supposes that the Bread becomes the Body of Christ, only in Sanctification and virtue.

FOURTHLY,

Euthym. Com-  
ment. in Mat.  
the. cap. 64.

FOURTHLY, *Euthymius Zigabenus*, a Greek Monk, that lived in the Twelfth Century, confirms the same thing. *We must not, say's he, consider the nature of things which are offered, but their virtue: For as the word deifies (if it be lawful to use such an expression) the Flesh to which it is united after a supernatural manner, so it changes by an ineffable operation the Bread and Wine into his Body, which is a Spring of Life, and into his precious Blood, and into the virtue of both one and the other.*

Lib. 24. cap.  
12. pag. 216.

MR. *Arnaud* nibbles at this Passage, *Euthymius*, say's he, say's that *Fesus* Christ changes after an ineffable manner, the Bread into his own Body. This signifies, say's Mr. *Claude*, that he changes it, not into his Body, but into the virtue of his Body. *Euthymius* say's, that he changes the Wine into his Blood. This signifies, say's Mr. *Claude*, that he changes it, not into his Blood, but into the virtue of his Blood. *Euthymius* adds, that he changes them into the virtue of both one and the other, in *gratiam ipsorum*. This Addition has perplexed Mr. *Claude*, and therefore he has thought good not to mention it. But in adding it, because 'tis there in effect, the whole expression of *Euthymius* expounded in the Calvinists sence will be, that *Fesus* Christ changes the Bread into the virtue of his Body, and the Wine into the virtue of his Blood, and into the virtue of both one and the other. Who ever heard of such a folly to joyn together the Metaphorical Term, and the exposition of the Metaphorical Term, as two distinct and separate things? Do we say, for example, that the Stone is *Fesus* Christ, and the Sign of *Fesus* Christ; that the Ark was the Church, and the Figure of the Church; that the Paschal Lamb was Christ, and the representation of Christ; that Anger changes men into Beasts, and into the fury of Beasts.

ALL this is but vain Rhetorick. *Euthymius* say's, *We must not consider the nature of the things offered us, but their virtue*. This is not the Language of a man, that would say, that the nature of Bread and Wine ceases to be, and that we must consider the proper Substance of *Fesus* Christ under the Vail of Accidents. This Expression on the contrary supposes that the nature of these things subsists, altho we must not consider it, but raise up our minds to the Consideration of the supernatural virtue they receive. When then he adds, that *Fesus* Christ changes the Bread, and Wine into his own Body and Blood, it is true that this signifies, according to my Interpretation, that he changes them into the virtue of his Body and Blood, and not into their Substance. But what he say's afterwards, and into the virtue of both one and the other, is not another distinct thing, or different from what he had said, being only the explication of it. This *Et* is an explicative Particle, which has the force of an *asmuch* as to say, as if he said, *They are changed into the Body and Blood, that is to say, into the virtue of both one and the other*. Mr. *Arnaud* must not think to blind us, by his, who ever heard? For there is nothing more common in Authors than the use of this Particle *Et*, in a sence of explication, which joyns not two several things, but two several expressions, which signifie one and the same thing, and one of which is the explication of the other. Thus Saint *Paul* say's, *That God created Meats to be received with Thankfulness by the Faithful. AND by those that know the Truth*. Again, *Peace be unto those that walk according to this Rule, AND on the Israel of God*. All these *Ets* are put for, that is to say's. Thus *Cyrillus* of *Alexandria* speaking of the effect of the Communion, the least *Eulogium*, say's he, mixes or confounds in it self our whole Body, AND fills it with its efficacy. Saint *Chrysostom*, and whereas we were men, he has made us Angels and Children of God. Saint *Augustin*,

1 Tim. 4. 3.

Gal. 6. 16.

*Cyrill. Alex.*  
in Joan. 6. 57.  
*Chrysost. Hom.*  
9. in Rom.

gustin, he that could change *Water into Wine*, is able to change *Grass into Gold*; *Aug. S. 17. 12.*  
*AND make of Flesh an Angel.* All these *ETS*, are explicatives, and *ex 40 Scri.*  
 are put for that is to say's. Mr. *Arnaud* need not contend about a thing so  
 well known as this is; I say then *Euthymius* having first said, *That we must*  
*not consider the nature of things which are placed on the Altar, but their virtue,*  
 and afterwards adding, *that Jesus Christ changes the Bread and Wine into his*  
*own Body and Blood, AND into the virtue of both one and the other*, the first  
 Proposition which respects only the *virtue*, in supposing that the nature of  
 Bread and Wine subsists, leads us to the understanding of the second, and  
 makes us easily comprehend, that 'tis as much as if he had said, that he chan-  
 ges them into his Body and Blood, which is to say, into the virtue both of the  
 one and th'other. For 'tis of the virtue not the substance, which his Dis-  
 course treats of. Had *Euthymius* meant by his change into the Body and  
 Blood, a change of Substance, what could move him to add, that they are  
 likewise changed into the virtue of both one and the other? Besides that to  
 speak properly, it would not be true, that the change was made into the vir-  
 tue, seeing it would terminate it self only in the Substance, and that the vir-  
 tue would be only as a sequel of the Substance, and not as a Term of the  
 change; besides this, I say, wherefore should he speak of this change of vir-  
 tue? To inform us that the Substance is not alone; but who doubts that the  
 sanctifying virtue of the Body and Blood is every where, where their Sub-  
 stance is, and what need is there of informing the Readers of this?

FIFTHLY, When *Euthymius* his expression were ambiguous, yet would  
 they be cleared up by those of other Greek Authors, that better explain them-  
 selves, and shew that the common Doctrine of this Church is, that the Bread  
 and Wine are the Body and Blood of Christ, inasmuch as they are changed  
 into their virtue.

*THEOPHYLACT*, who lived in the Eleventh Century, thus ex-  
 presses himself; *Because the Bread and Wine are Food familiar to us, and we* *Theophyl. in*  
*are not able to endure Flesh and Blood to be set before us, God therefore who is full* *Marc 14.*  
*of pity, accommodating himself to our weakness, conserves the Species of Bread*  
*and Wine; but changes them into the VIRTUE of his Flesh and Blood.*

WE must observe, he makes this answer, to People, that doubted, whether  
 the Bread was the Flesh of Jesus Christ, because they saw no such thing as the  
 latter of these. When then he tells them, that the Bread and Wine are changed  
 into the virtue of the Flesh and Blood; it is clear he means, that the Bread and  
 Wine are changed only in virtue, whence it follows, 'tis not to be expected they  
 should appear to be Flesh and Blood, for otherwise he would not satisfy the dif-  
 ficulty he had proposed. Were they changed into the real Substance of Flesh  
 and Blood, as well as into their virtue, the doubt would still remain, to wit,  
 that they must still appear Flesh and Blood. The change of Virtue would  
 not decide the Question. We shall examine in their due order, all the frivo-  
 lous exceptions, which Mr. *Arnaud* opposes against the evidence of this Pas-  
 sage, and likewise hope to give a satisfactory account to whatsoever he alled-  
 ges from this Author. I must not now interrupt my Proof by a Digression  
 which would carry me too far. It is sufficient to shew, that *Theophylact* ex-  
 pressly affirms, that if the Bread and Wine appear not to be Flesh and Blood,  
 'tis because God changes them into the virtue of this Flesh and Blood.

VI. IF we ascend higher than the Eleventh Century, we shall find the  
 same belief and expressions amongst the *Greeks* of those times, which will



*Elias Cret.  
Comment. in  
Oratio. Apul.  
Greg. Naz.*

give us greater light into the belief of the Moderns. Observe here how *Ely* Archbishop of *Candia*, the Commentator on *Gregory Nazianzen* expresses himself. Saint *Gregory* having called the *Eucharist* an external Sacrifice and an Antitype. By this external Sacrifice, say's *Ely*, he means that which is celebrated with Bread and Wine, which being placed on the Holy Table, are really changed by the power of Almighty God into the Body and Blood of *Fesus Christ*. Were there no more said but this, Mr. *Arnaud* would be sure to triumph; but hear what follows, For, adds he, to the end we might not be struck with horror in seeing *Flesh* and *Blood* upon the Holy Table, God condescending to our weakness indues the Elements, set before us, with an enlivening quality, and changes them into the efficacy (or operation) of his *Flesh*. This Author lived about the Eighth Century, and was present at the Council of *Nice*.

*Nicet. Annal.  
lib. 3.*

VII. WE have already seen in the Quotations of *Nicetas Choniatus*, a Passage of *Eutychus*, which asserts the same Doctrine as the rest. This Author lived (if I be not mistaken) towards the end of the Sixth Century, for I believe he is the same *Eutychus* against whom *Gregory the Great*, being at *Constantinople*, disputed touching the Resurrection. But howsoever, he say's, according to the Relation we have from *Nicetas*, That the Body and Blood of *Fesus Christ* being applied to the Antitypes, by Consecration, imprint on them, Their proper Powers (or proper virtues) οὐδας δυνάμεις. It was he from whom we had the comparison of the Seal, which applied to Wax, imprints its Character thereon, which does moreover represent this impression of virtue, we now speak of.

*Victor Antioch.  
Com. MS.  
in Marc.*

VIII. IN the Fifth Century, lived *Cyrillus Alexandriensis*, and *Victor* of *Antioch*; which latter relates these Words of *Cyrillus*, not to contradict, but to approve them. Lest we should conceive horror at the sight of *Flesh* and *Blood* on the Holy Table, God in regard to our weakness, indues the things thereon offered with a VIRTUE of life, and changes them into the efficacy of his *Flesh*, to the end they may be to us a vivifying Communion, and that the Body of life may be found in us as a living Seed.

*Epiph. Serm. de  
Fide Eccles. &  
in Anacephal.*

IX. IN the Fourth Century Saint *Epiphanius* held the same Language. They that come, say's he, to the Baptism, receive the virtue which *Fesus Christ* brought to it when he descended into it, and are illuminated by the communication of his light. Thus, is the Oracle of the Prophet, accomplished, which say's, that there shall happen in *Jerusalem* a change in the virtue of Bread and Water, and there shall be given to them a saving virtue. For here, to wit, in *Fesus Christ*, the virtue of Bread and force of Water are made strong, not that the Bread is thus powerful to us, but the virtue of the Bread: For as to the Bread, it is indeed an Aliment, but there is in him a VIRTUE to inviven us.

*Greg. Niss. in  
Bapt. Chr.*

X. GREGORY of *Nisse*, in this same Century, spake to the very same effect. You see, say's he, that Water is made use of in the Holy Baptism, but you must not therefore despise it, for 'tis of great virtue and marvellous efficacy. Do you see this Holy Altar where we attend? As to its nature, 'tis a common stone, which differs in nothing from others with which we build our Houses. But when it has been sanctified by the Divine Service performed thereon, and received the blessing, it becomes a Holy Table, an impolluted Altar, which all the World cannot touch, the Sacred Ministers alone touch it, but yet with respect. So the Bread is at first common Bread, but after the Mystical Consecration, it is called, and is the Body of *Fesus Christ*. I affirm the same concerning the Mystical Oyl and

and Wine, these are things of small value before their Consecration; but when bless'd by the Holy Spirit, both the one, and th'other operate after an excellent manner. His Design, is to shew, how mere Water, such as is used in Baptism, comes to have such great virtue, and produces such admirable effects. For this purpose he alledges divers Examples of mean and despicable things in themselves, which by their Consecration, acquire an excellent virtue and efficacy. Amongst which, he especially reckons the Bread, and Wine, in the *Eucharist*. As to the Wine, he makes use of the Term of, *operate*, but as to the Bread, he say's, 'tis the Body of Jesus Christ; which plainly shews, that in his sence, to be the Body of Jesus Christ, and to have an excellent operation, is but one and the same thing.

XI. WE find at the end of *Clement Alexandrinus* his Works, a Treatise of a Greek Author, named *Theodotus*; who lived in the Third Century, wherein he asserts this same change of virtue, *The Bread and Oyl*, say's he, *are sanctified by virtue of the Holy Spirit. They are no longer then, what they were before, notwithstanding their outward appearance, but are changed, INTO A SPIRITUAL EFFICACY.* Epitome. Theodot. in calce, oper. Clem. Alex.

WE have here then, the Doctrine of the *Greeks*, cleared up, by express Testimonies, both from Modern, and Ancient Authors. So that methinks Mr. *Arnaud* has no reason to turn into sport, and raillery, as he has done, this change of virtue, in calling it our *Key of Virtue*. Every man sees 'tis no invention of ours, and that we alledge nothing concerning it, but what is authoriz'd, by good and real Passages, and by the Sentiments and proper expressions of the *Greeks* of greatest account in all Ages. When Mr. *Arnaud* shall produce as many and solid Testimonies for his change of Substance, we will give him leave to deride our change of virtue, as he is pleased to term it. But till then, I have reason to desire him to stop his Laughter.

I should now pass on to the proving my Proposition, *That, the Greeks believe the Bread and Wine only thus become the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ to the Faithful*; but having already established this Article, in the Sixth Chapter, and drawn from thence an Argument, to shew they believe not Transubstantiation, I shall therefore for the avoiding needless Repetitions, refer the Reader to it.

I come then to the last Article, which, contains, that the *Greeks* hold the Bread, is made the proper and real Body of Jesus Christ, by means of the addition of his Natural Body. This Point calls for a particular consideration, for not only, it will further discover to us, what the real Opinion of the *Greeks* is; but likewise shew us, whence come these emphatical expressions, which they sometimes use, in saying 'tis the very Body of Jesus Christ, and no other Body than that which was born of the Virgin *Mary*, and likewise shew us in what sence we must understand them.

I. I say then, among other Comparisons, the *Greeks* use, for the explaining the manner of this change, which happens to the Bread and Wine; they especially imploy, that of Food, which being received by us, is changed into our Bodies. Now, every man knows, that the Matter or Substance of Food, is not changed, into the first Substance which we had before we take it, in such a manner that the one must be absolutely the other, and by a Numerical Identity; on the contrary, each substance conserves its proper being, and that

Theophil. i. Jo-  
an 6.

- that of the Food, is joyned to that of our Body, and receives its Form, it augments it, and by way of Union, Augmentation, and Assimilation (as they speak) becomes ours, and makes but one and the same Body, and not two, with that which we had before. And this is the Comparison, the Greeks do most often urge, whereby to express their Conceptions touching the Holy Sacrament. *Theophilact*, in his Commentaries on Saint *John's* Gospel, having told us, the Bread we eat in the Mysteries, is not an Antitype of the Flesh of Jesus Christ, but the very Flesh it self, immediately adds these Words, *The Bread is changed into the Flesh of Christ, by the Ineffable Words, the Mystical Benediction, and coming of the Holy Spirit. No man ought to be troubled, in being obliged, to believe, that Bread becomes Flesh. For when our Lord was conversant on Earth, and received his nourishment from Bread, this Bread he eat, was changed into his Body, being made like unto his Flesh, and contributed to augment and sustain it after a humane manner. And thus, now, is the Bread changed into our Lord's Flesh.*

Bibl. Patr.  
Tom. 2. Græco-  
Lat.

*THEODORUS Abucara*, Bishop, and Metropolitan of Carie, and contemporary with *Photius*, according to *Gretzer* the Jesuites conjecture, borrowed the same Comparison, whereby to explain, how the Bread is made the Body of Christ. He introduces in one of his Dialogues, a Saracen disputing with him on this Subject. The Saracen. Tell me, Bishop; why do ye Priests so impose on other Christians? Of the same Flower, you make two Loaves, the one for common use, and th'other you divide into several pieces, distributing 'em to the People, which you call the Body of Jesus Christ, and persuade them it confers remission of sins. Do ye deceive your selves, or the People, whose Guides you are? The Christian. We neither abuse our selves nor others. The Saracen. Prove me this then, not by Scripture, but by reason. The Christian. What do ye say? Is not the Bread made the Body of Jesus Christ? The Saracen. I know not what to answer to that. The Christian. When your Mother first brought you forth into the World, was you then as big as you are now? The Saracen? No, I was born a little one, and became bigger by means of Food, God thus ordering it. The Christian. Has the Bread then been made your Body? The Saracen. Yes. The Christian. And how was this done? The Saracen. I know not the manner thereof. The Christian. The Bread descends into the Stomach, and by the heat of the Liver, the grossest parts separating themselves, the rest are converted into Chyle, the Liver attracting them to it, and changing them into Blood, and afterwards distributes 'em by means of the Veins, to all the parts of the Body, that they may be what they are, bone to bones, marrow to marrow, sinew to sinews, eye to eyes, hair to hair, nail to nails, and thus by this means the Child grows, and becomes a Man, the Bread being converted in to his Body, and the Drink into his Blood. The Saracen. I believe so. The Christian. Know then that our Mystery is made after the same manner, the Priest places Bread and Wine on the Holy Table, and praying, the Holy Spirit descends thereon, and the efficacy of its Divinity changes them into the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, neither more nor less, than the Liver changes the Food into the Body of a Man.

Apud Leo-  
nem Allat.  
post distribuc  
de Simeon &  
alia Collec. 1.

*THEODORUS Graptus*, a Greek Monk, who lived in the Ninth Century, uses likewise the same Comparison; *We do not call, say's he, the Holy Mysteries, an Image, or Figure, of the Body of Jesus Christ; altho they be a Symbolical Representation thereof, but the very deified Body of Jesus Christ, he himself saying, if ye eat not the Flesh of the Son of man, and drink his Blood, ye have no life in you. And this is what he taught his Disciples, when he said*



to 'em, take, and eat my Body, not a Figure of my Body; for thus did he form his Flesh, of the Substance of the Virgin, by the Holy Spirit. Which may be explained likewise by things familiar to us: for as the Bread, Wine, and Water, do naturally change themselves into the Body and Blood of him that eats and drinks them. So by the Prayers of the Priest, and Descent of the Holy Spirit, these things are supernaturally changed into the Body, and Blood of Jesus Christ. And this is done by the Priest's Prayer, and yet we understand not that this is two Bodies, but one and the same Body.

NICEPHORUS, the Patriarch of Constantinople, and Contemporary with Theodorus Graptus, say's the same thing, in a Passage which *Allatius* <sup>*de perp. Conf. lib. 3. cap. 15.*</sup> and Mr. Arnaud after him, has related. If it be lawful, say's he, to explain *M. Arn. lib. 7 cap. 5 p. 662.* these things by a humane Comparison, as the Bread, Wine, and Water, are naturally changed into the Body and Blood of those, that eat and drink them, and become not another Body, so these Gifts by the Prayer of him that officiates, and descent of the Holy Spirit, are changed supernaturally into the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ. For this is what is contained in the Priest's Prayer, and we understand not that this is two Bodies, but one and the same Body.

THIS way of explaining the change of the Bread and Wine, is not peculiar to these Authors alone, whom I now alledged. Damascen, who according to Mr. Arnaud, is to be esteemed as the common Oracle of the Greeks; made use of it, in his Fourth Book of the Orthodox Faith. *As in Baptism,* <sup>*Damascen. de fide Oribod. lib. 4. cap. 14.*</sup> say's he, because men are wont to wash and anoint themselves, God has added to the Oyl, and Water, the Grace of his Holy Spirit, and made thereof the Laver of our Regeneration: so in like manner, because we are wont to eat Bread, and drink Wine and Water; he has joyned to these things his Divinity, and made them his Body and Blood, to the end that by things familiar to our nature, he might raise us above nature. This is really the Body united to the Divinity, the Body born of the Virgin. Not, that the Body which ascended up on high, descends from Heaven; but because the Bread, and Wine are changed, into the Body and Blood of God. If you ask how this comes to pass; it will be sufficient to tell ye that 'tis by means of the Holy Spirit; and after the same manner as he became Flesh in the Virgin's Womb. All that we know of it is this, that the Word of God is true, efficacious, and Almighty; and that the manner of this change is inconceivable. Yet we may say, that as naturally the Bread we eat, the Wine and Water we drink, are changed into the Body and Blood of him, that eats and drinks, and yet become not another Body than that which he had before, so after the same manner the Bread and Wine, which are placed on the Altar, are supernaturally changed into the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ by Prayer, and Descent of the Holy Spirit; and these are not two Bodies; but one and the same Body.

IT is probable, that Damascen, and the others aforementioned, who use this Comparison, have taken it out of the Carechism of Gregory of Nyffe; wherein we find almost the same Conceptions. For, he say's, that as the *Bread which Jesus Christ eat, was changed into his Body, and received thereby a* <sup>*Gregor. Nyff. in Orat. Catechet.*</sup> *divine virtue; the same likewise comes to pass in the Eucharist. For there, it was the Grace of the Word, that sanctified the Body, which was nourished with Bread, and was in some sort Bread; and here after the same manner, the Bread is sanctified by the Word of God, and by Prayer; not being in truth made the Body of the Word, by Manducation, but by being changed in an instant by the Word into the Body of Christ, according to what he said himself, this is my Body.*

THIS

THIS Comparifon does already fufficiently enough declare the Doctrine of the Greek Church; to wit, that the Substance of Bread conferving its proper being, is joyned to the natural Body of Jesus Chrift; that it is made like unto it, that it augments it, and becomes by this means one and the ſame Body with him. For 'tis thus the Aliment we take, (altho it conſerves its own Substance and proper being) becomes one with our Body, by way of Addition, or Augmentation.

*Durand in 4.  
ſent. diſt. 11.  
quaſt. 3.*

*Bell. de Sac.  
Euch. lib. 3.  
cap. 13.*

*DURANDUS* a Biſhop, and Famous Divine, amongſt the *Latins*, who lived in the beginning of the Fourteenth Century, acknowledged the force of this Comparifon, and made it be obſerved by thoſe in his time, and alſo uſed it himſelf, to ſtrengthen his Opinion, which was, that the Substance of Bread remains, and loſing its firſt form of Bread, receives the natural form of the Body of Chrift. *Bellarmin* answers, that theſe Comparifons muſt not be ſtrained too far, that they are not in all things alike, and that the *Greeks* only uſe that of Food to ſhew the reality and truth of the change, which happens in the Bread and Wine in the Sacrament; and not to ſignifie that this change is made in the ſame manner. And this is in my mind as much as can be ſaid with any ſhew of reaſon. We muſt then ſee here, whether in the ſence of the *Greeks*, we may extend the Comparifon of the Food, ſo as to underſtand thereby, that the Bread and Wine are made the Body and Blood of Jesus Chrift, by way of Augmentation of this Body, for if it appears they take it in this manner, *Bellarmin's* Answer ſignifies nothing; and our Proof will be compleat and undeniable.

*Damaſcen. E.  
piſt. ad Zachar.  
Doar. & in  
Hum. de Corp.  
& Sancti Dom.  
in Edit. Biblii.*

*DAMASCEN*, decides the Queſtion himſelf in his Letter to *Zacharias* Biſhop of *Doare*, and in the ſhort Homily which follows it. Obſerve here, what he ſay's in his Letter. *Touching the Body of our Lord, of which we partake, I declare to you, it cannot be ſaid there are two Bodies of Jesus Chrift; there being but one alone. For as the Child aſſoon as he is born is compleat, but receives his growth from eating and drinking; and altho he grows thereby, yet cannot be ſaid to have two bodies, but only one, ſo by greater reaſon the Bread and Wine, by Deſcent of the Holy Spirit, are made one only Body, and not two by the AUGMENTATION OF THE BODY OF CHRIST.*

BUT to the end it may not be thought this Diſcourſe ſlipt from him unawares, obſerve here how he explains, his mind in the following Homily. *This Body, and Blood of our God, of which we partake, is ſubject to Corruption, being broken, ſpilt, eaten, and drunk, and paſſes thro all the natural Oeconomy of the Incarnation of the Word, which comes to paſſ in the ſame manner, as the GROWTH of our Bodies. For as to our Bodies, the firſt thing ſuppoſed, is the matter of which the Embryo conſiſts, afterwards the Mother furniſhing it with the Aliment of her Blood, this matter is changed by little and little, and becomes an organiſed Body, by means of the virtue which our Creature has given to nature. In the ſame manner is formed the Fleſh, Bones, and reſt of the Parts, by the aſſiſtance of the Faculties deſtin'd for Attraction, Retention, Nouriſhment and Growth. So likewise the Food we take, increaſes and augments the maſs of our Body, by the miniſtry of theſe ſame Faculties, deſigned for nourishment; which attract, retain, and change the Food. And therefore our Lord ſhews us the whole divine Oeconomy of his Incarnation, Crucifixion, Burial, Reſurrection, and State of Corruption in this GROWTH of his Body. For the Body of our Lord became not immediately incorruptible, but corruptible, and paſſible, till his Reſurrection; and after*

after his Burial became incorruptible, by this same Divine Power, by which he raised himself, and makes us also incorruptible : But how comes this to pass? The Holy Virgin has been as it were the Table whereon was the Substance of Bread, when according to the saying of the Angel, the Holy Spirit came upon her, and the virtue of the most High overshadowed her, that is to say, the Divine Word, the Divine Person who took Flesh of her. So likewise here the Substance which is Bread, and Wine mingled with Water, is placed on the Mystical Table, as it were in the Womb of the Virgin, for even the Virgin was nourished with these things, and distributed the Substance of them to the Body of the Child. In fine, the Priest, he say's, in imitation of the Angel, let the Holy Spirit come upon, and sanctifie these things, and make the Bread, the Sacred Body of Jesus Christ; and the Chalice his precious Blood. Then there is made not by the virtue of nature; but supernaturally, and by the AUGMENTATION of the Body and Blood of Christ, there is made, I say, one only Body, and not two. After this, it is lifted up by the hand of the Priest, as he was lifted up on the Cross, it is distributed, broken and buried in us, to make us thereby incorruptible. And thus the Oeconomy is finished.

AND this is the Doctrine of the Greeks, the Bread, and Wine, are made the Body and Blood of Christ, in the same manner the Food we receive becomes our Body, and this Example or Comparison exactly comprehends three things. The first, that as Nature observes the same course, and performs the same Operations in the Food we receive, as it does in the first matter of which our Bodies are composed; so Divine Grace keeps the same measures, and does the same things in the Bread and Wine, as in the Body our Lord took of the Virgin. This is in all respects the same Oeconomy. They receive the same Holy Spirit; are corruptible, raised up as it were on a Cross, buried in us, and in fine become incorruptible. The second, that as the Food increases, and gives growth to our Bodies; so the Bread and mystical Wine, are a Growth or Augmentation which the Body of Jesus Christ receives. The third, that as the Food makes not another Body, but becomes one and the same Body with that which it augments; so the Mystery is not a new Body of Jesus Christ, but the same which was born of the Virgin.

MOREOVER, altho the Greeks use the Simile of Food, (whereby to explain the manner after which the Bread in the Eucharist becomes the Body of Christ) yet we must not imagine, they believe the Bread receives the physical or natural form of our Lord's Flesh in the same manner the Food receives that of ours; whether we understand by this physical Form, the Soul of Jesus Christ, or some other substantial Form subordinate to the Soul: This is not at all their Belief; for they only mean, that as the Food we eat receives the physical or natural Form of our Body, so the Bread in the Eucharist receives the impression of the inlivening and sanctifying virtue, residing in the natural Body of Christ; and that as the Food in receiving the physical Form of our Flesh, becomes an Augmentation of our Body; so the Bread in the Eucharist receiving the impression of the virtue of the Body of Jesus Christ, becomes an Augmentation. This is a Comparison, wherein there is some proportion of one thing with another, but not an intire resemblance. The Greeks conceive the sanctifying virtue of the Body of Jesus Christ, as its supernatural and œconomical Form, which belongs to it not so much for that it is a mere Body, as that it is the Body of the Word, the Principle of our Spiritual Life and Salvation.

THERE



T H E R E is made then according to them, not a Communication, or an extension of the natural Form of the Body of Jesus Christ on the Bread ; but a communication or an extension of its virtue.

W H I C H plainly appears by what we have already alledged. For first, hereto relates this composition of Bread and Holy Spirit ; and Union of Bread with the Divinity which they assert. Secondly, hitherto expressly relate, all the Passages we have seen touching the change of *virtue*, to which the *Greeks* so strictly keep themselves ; never mentioning the impression of the physical Form ; but ever that of *virtue*. Thirdly, we gather the same thing from their comparing the Bread in the *Eucharist* with the natural Body, whereby to establish how the Bread is made an Augmentation of the Body, they say not that the same physical Form of the one is communicated to the other ; but only that the same Oeconomy, which is observed in the natural Body, is likewise observed in the Bread. And explaining in what consists this same Oeconomy ; they say, 'tis in that the Bread receives the Holy Spirit, as the natural Body receives it, that 'tis raised up (as it were) into a Cross, in the like manner as the natural Body, that 'tis buried in us, and becomes in fine incorruptible, as the natural Body does. Now this is quite different from the impression of the physical Form ; and gives only the *Idea* of an impression of virtue. Fourthly, the same thing appears from a great part of the Proofs I produced in this third Book, as from what they teach touching the unconsecrated Particles ; that they become in some sort the Body of Jesus Christ, by connection with that which is consecrated ; and that the People may receive them as well as the Sacrament ; for this shews they mean the consecrated Bread becomes only the Body of Jesus Christ by the impression of this sanctifying virtue of which we speak. And that which they believe touching the *Eucharist* consecrated on Holy Thursday, that 'tis of a more excellent virtue than that of other days ; for this would have no sence, did they hold the impression of the natural Form of the Flesh of Jesus Christ on the Bread. And all the Clauses of their Liturgies, by which it appears, they restrain the effect of the Consecration, to the Bread's becoming the Body of Jesus Christ in Sanctification, and Virtue. And what they say touching the dead ; that they receive the same as we do in the Communion ; which would be absurd if they meant the physical Form of the Flesh of Christ was imprinted on the Bread, for the dead receive not this physical Form. And their not adoring the Sacrament, with an absolute Adoration of *Latria*, as do the *Latins*, and as the *Greeks* would do without doubt, if they held the impression of the physical Form. And that which the *Greeks* of the Twelfth Century mentioned touching the *Eucharist*, namely, that 'tis not indued with a *Soul*, or *Understanding* ; which shews clearly, they do not mean the Bread in the Sacrament receives the impression of the Soul of Christ. And in fine, that they take so little care to preserve the Substance of the Sacrament ; using it after such a negligent manner, as would be highly criminal and impious, or to speak better, after such a manner as is not conceivable, did they believe the physical Form of the Flesh of Jesus Christ.

B U T to finish the justification of my Proposition touching the Belief of the *Greeks*, there only remains to be proved, the Comparison of the Paper, which becomes the Princes Letter, when it receives his Characters or Seal. For as concerning that of the Food, we have already sufficiently treated on it ;

it; we have likewise considered that of Wood in conjunction with Fire; that of Wool which takes the dye, and that of Wax or Matter which receives the impression of the Seal. As to that of Paper, *Nilus* Abbot of Mount *Sina*, (an Author of the Fifth Century, and who was Saint *Chrysostom's* Schollar) furnishes us with it, in one of his Epistles. Paper, say's he, consists of a certain Matter, and is called only Paper, but when the Emperor puts thereunto his Seal or Name, it becomes Sacred. In the same manner must our Mysteries be conceived. Before the Words of the Priest, and Descent of the Holy Spirit, 'tis mere Bread and Wine, which are offered; but after the Holy Prayers, and coming of the holy and enlivening Spirit, 'tis no longer mere Bread and Wine, but the pretious and immaculate Body of *Jesus Christ*, who is God over all, and therefore those that receive them with fear and reverence, are cleansed from all filthiness.

HAVING thus historically and sincerely shew'd, the real Belief of the *Greeks* touching the *Eucharist*, it will be no hard matter to observe wherein they agree with the *Latins*, and wherein they differ; which is the second thing I propos'd to do in this Chapter. First, They agree with them, in the general Terms, which denote the change of the Bread and Wine into the Body and Blood of Christ. Secondly, They agree in those other expressions, which bear, that the change is made into the real Body of Christ, into his own proper Body born of the Virgin *Mary*, and that he has not two Bodies, but one alone. Thirdly, They agree in that both of them attribute this change to the Holy Spirit, who descends on the Bread, and makes it the Body of our Lord. Fourthly, They agree in fine, in that they both assert, this change to be an effect of the Almighty Power of God, above all the Laws of nature. So far the *Greeks* and *Latins* agree.

BUT they differ in several things. First, In that the *Latins* believe, that the Substance of Bread ceases, the *Greeks* on the contrary believe its existence. Which we plainly gather from the Proposition I now established, and the Proofs I offered: For seeing they make the *Eucharist* to consist of the composition of a sensible Substance, which is the Bread, and the Holy Spirit, as we have already observed, seeing they joyn the Bread to the Divinity, believing that what results thence is double, that is to say, that it has two Natures, it is clear the *Greeks* hold that the Nature or Substance of Bread remains. This same truth appears likewise, concerning what they hold touching this Augmentation of the Body of Christ. For if the Bread in the *Eucharist* augments, or gives growth to our Lord's Body, as they believe, it ceases not to be, being certain, that to make an Augmentation, we must add one thing to another, joyn them together, conserve them both, and destroy neither of them. To this we are moreover led by all those Comparisons we find they used, of Wool dyed, of Paper that receives the Emperors Signet, of Wax that receives the impression of the Seal, of a burning Coal, or Wood in conjunction with Fire, and Food by which we are nourished; for in all these Examples, the subject matter looses nothing of its first Substance. Moreover seeing they will have the Bread pass thro all the Degrees of the Oeconomy of *Jesus Christ*, that 'tis first corruptible, then incorruptible, this sufficiently denotes they mean the Bread remains, whereby to receive all these changes.

SECONDLY, From this difference there arises another, which is, that the *Latins* believe that in the change which happens in the *Eucharist*,

Hh

the

the Substance of Bread, and that of the Body of Jesus Christ, are (as they speak) the two Terms of the change, and that of the Bread passes intirely into that of the Body by a Conversion, not only mystical, but really, and which destroys the Existence, or matter of the Bread, which the *Greeks* do not believe. Which appears by this Augmentation of the Body of Jesus Christ, of which they tell us, and which they confirm by the Simile of Food. For common sense plainly shews us, that that which augments a thing is not really changed into the thing augmented, as the *Latins* understand their change. For there must always be reckoned a real difference between the thing augmented, and that which augments. The Opinion of the *Greeks* then can in no wise agree with that of the *Latins*, for according to the *Latins*, the Substance of the natural Body of Jesus Christ receives neither more, nor less, by the Conversion of the Substance of Bread into it, and according to the *Greeks* it is augmented by it.

**THIRDLY,** It must then be granted, the *Greeks* do not acknowledge this conversion, specified by the Roman Church; and differ from it in respect of the nature or kind of this change, admitting only that of an Object, which receiving a new Form, remains what it was before; and yet becomes what it was not, which is to say, that the Bread remaining Bread, receives the supernatural and economical Form of the Body of Christ, that is to say its virtue, and is thereby made this Body. And this is what is meant by this change of Sanctification and Virtue, which they establish, and by which they pretend the Bread becomes our Lord's Body. Their whole Doctrine centers in this, and 'tis not possible to see what I alledged from them in this Chapter, and not make this Conclusion, that their Opinion is, there only happens in the *Eucharist* a change of virtue, and that 'tis only thus, the same Substance, which is Bread, is likewise the Body of Jesus Christ.

**FOURTHLY,** The *Latins* hold that the Substance we receive in the Sacrament is absolutely the same numerical Substance which our Saviour had when he was on Earth, and which he still retains in Heaven. The *Greeks* hold not this, their Hypothesis manifestly opposes it. For altho they say the Body born of the Virgin *Mary*, and the Bread in the Sacrament, are not two Bodies, but one, yet the manner after which they explain this Unity, and the reason they give for it, do clearly denote they mean not thereby an absolute Unity, nor an intire or numerical Identity, (as the Schools speak) such as the *Latins* establish. They say, that as that which a Child eats and drinks makes not another Body, but the same, altho he receives growth thereby; so the Bread in the Sacrament, which augments the Body of Christ; makes not two Bodies, but one. Now this necessarily supposes, that this Substance which we receive with the mouths of our Bodies in the *Eucharist*, is different from that which our Saviour had on Earth, and which he still has in Heaven. For a Body that is augmented is the same it was before; but the Augmentation can never be absolutely the same thing, as that which receives Augmentation. In effect, if the *Latins* be asked, and all those that follow their Hypothesis, why the Bread in the *Eucharist*, and the Body born of the Virgin, are not two, but one only Body, they will answer, 'Tis because they are but one and the same Substance in number. But instead of this the *Greeks* take a different course, saying, 'tis because the Bread is an Augmentation of the Body of Christ, which puts a real difference between the two Substances. Whence it follows, that that which they believe they receive in the Sacrament, is not the same Substance as that of our Lord's natural Body.

**FIFTHLY,**



FIFTHLY, Hence it appears, the *Greeks* do not believe the *Real Presence* of the *Latins*. For the *Latins* by the *Real Presence*, mean a *Presence* of *Substance*; which is to say, that this same *Substance* of the natural *Body* of *Jesus Christ*, in which he lived and died, and rose again, and which now exists in Heaven, the same I say in *Number*, really likewise exists, substantially, and by it self in the *Eucharist*. Now this the *Greeks* do not hold, as I already shewed. They on the contrary believe that this *Substance* we receive in the *Eucharist*, and that of the natural *Body* of *Christ*, are two *Substances* really different, one of which is the *Augmentation*, and th'other the thing augmented, the one a true *Substance* of *Bread*, and th'other the *Substance* of the natural *Body* of *Christ*: The one, to wit, that of *Bread*, receives according to them the impression of the virtue of th'other, and the other communicates this to it. They do not then believe, that this same natural *Body* of *Christ*, this same numerical *Substance* in which he died, and rose again, and which now exists in Heaven, does likewise really exist in the *Eucharist*, which is exactly, as I already said, the *real Presence* of the *Latins*. They hold the *Bread*, becomes by *Consecration*, not a *Figure* of the *Body* of *Christ*, but an *Augmentation*, inasmuch as it receives its *Virtue and Efficacy*. If this must be called a kind of *Real Presence*, I say, this is but a mere amusement of Words, not worth our consideration. In short, the *Presence* of the *Greeks*, is a *Presence of Virtue*, that of the *Latins* a *Presence of Substance*; so that upon this account they are at a great difference. In effect, if the things I alledged, as well in this Chapter, as in this whole Third Book, be exactly considered, it will appear, that the most part of the Proofs I produced to justify, that the *Greeks* believe not *Transubstantiation*, do equally conclude against the *Substantial Presence*; and that they also believe not, there is made any impression of the physical Form of *Christ's Body* on the *Bread*.

SIXTHLY, These principal and essential differences, produce others. For it hence appears, that altho they agree with the *Latins* in these general expressions, which bear, that the *Bread* is changed into the *Body* of *Christ*, into his real *Body*, into his own proper *Body*, yet they differ from them in the sense of these expressions, understanding them in a quite different manner. For the *Latins* mean the *Bread* is changed into the *Body* by a real *Transubstantiation*, which making the *Substance* of *Bread* cease, becomes the proper substance of the *Body* of *Jesus Christ*, the same in number which it was before. The *Greeks* on the contrary mean, that the *Bread*, remaining *Bread* in its proper *Substance*, is changed into the proper *Body* of *Christ*, inasmuch as that 'tis made an increase or augmentation, by the impression it receives from its virtue. So that when both one and the other say, the *Bread* is the *Body* of *Christ*, they in no sort agree, in the sense of this Proposition; the *Latins* understanding it in a divided sense (as they term it) which is to say, that that which was before *Bread* is now no longer so, but the *Body* of *Jesus Christ*; the *Greeks* on the contrary, that that which is still *Bread*, is also this *Body*.

VII. THE *Latins* following their Hypothesis, are forced to admit the Existence of Accidents without a Subject, the *Greeks* are not. Whence it is, they never mention this pretended Existence, and we find no such thing in their Authors.

VIII. THE *Latins* are obliged to give a reason for several natural Experiments;

periments, which denote, that the Substance of Bread remains, and which seem incompatible with their Belief, as that our Bodies are nourished with the *Eucharist*, that it breeds Maggots in it, &c. in which they are extremely puzzled. The *Greeks* are not so, neither do we find the least hint thereof in their Books.

IX. THE *Latins* cannot but admit the Existence of the same Body in several places at once; The *Greeks* know not any thing of this, neither are they concerned at it.

X. THE *Latins* are forced to make the Body of Christ exist in the Sacrament, void of his natural proportion and properties. The *Greeks* do not so, and therefore we see them never troubled at these difficulties which follow the Doctrine of the *Latins*.

XI. THE *Latins* by an unavoidable consequence of their Doctrine, adore with a Sovereign Adoration the *Eucharist*; which is according to them the proper Substance of our Lord's natural Body, separate from any other Substance. The *Greeks* do not so, as we observed in the seventh Chapter.

XII. THE *Latins*, believe the wicked receive the Body, and Blood of Christ, with the mouths of their bodies, altho to their condemnation. The *Greeks* hold that the Bread and Wine are made this Body and Blood, only to the Faithful.

NOT to insist on several other differences, which do not precisely relate to our Question, as that the *Greeks* do all of 'em communicate of both kinds, whereas the *Latins* give only to the People that of Bread; that the *Greeks* hold the Consecration is performed by the Prayer of the Priest, and the *Latins* on the contrary by these Words, *This is my Body*; that the *Latins* use Wafers, or unleavened Bread, whereas the *Greeks* abhorring the *Azymes* use only that which is leavened. There are likewise several other differences which I shall not here repeat, because the Reader may find them, in what has been already said in the foregoing Chapters.

AND here have I represented, as exactly as I could, the Differences and Agreements of the two Churches. If it be now demanded in what Points we agree with the *Greeks*, this may be easily collected from what I have already said.

WE agree almost with them in all Points wherein they differ from the *Latins*. 1. In that we do not believe the Conversion of Substances, any more than they, nor admit, the substantial Presence of the Natural Body of Christ, under the Species of Bread and Wine, that we adore not the Sacrament, nor acknowledge any of the Consequences of the Doctrine of Transubstantiation. 2. We agree with the *Greeks*, in that they conceive the change which is made in the Bread and Wine, to be a change of virtue by the efficacy of the Holy Spirit, God not destroying the Nature of Bread and Wine, but adding his Grace to Nature. 3. In that, we do not believe any more than they, that the wicked receive the Body of Jesus Christ. 4. In that we believe with them, that we ought to communicate of both kinds. 5. In our holding the Consecration is performed by Prayer. 6. In fine, that we deliver the Sacrament in leavened Bread, altho we hold the use of the *Azyme* an indifferent thing.

YET

YET it must not be imagined, we pretend there's no difference in the Opinion of the *Greeks* and ours. I do not believe any of our Doctōrs ever asserted such a thing. Mr. *Arnaud* would make the World believe I maintained this, and has triumphed thereupon in several places of his Book, as if I supposed the *Greeks* were *Berengarians* or *Calvinists*. But this is a groundless charge. I only denied that the *Greeks* (which are called *Schismatics*) believed Transubstantiation, and the Adoration. It belongs to him therefore to see whether he had reason to accuse me in this of *rashness and inconceivable boldness*, or whether he himself rather was not guilty of this, when he bragged of *confounding Ministers* with the number of his Proofs. Perhaps he would have hit better on it, had he said he had confounded his Readers. But to let this pass, I shall here truly denote the principal differences between the Doctrine of the *Greeks* and ours.

I. THE *Greeks*, since the Eighth Century, rejected the Terms of *Type* and *Figure*, in reference to the *Eucharist*, altho they use them of *Symbol* and *Representation*. We admit equally both as the Fathers of the first six Ages ever did.

II. THEY seem willing to keep in some sort the literal sense of these Words, *This is my Body*, which we do not. For we understand 'em in this sense, this Bread is the Sacred Sign, or the Sacrament of my Body; or which is to the same effect, the Bread signifies my Body. They on the contrary, taking the Term *est* in some sort according to the Letter, will have the same Substance, which is Bread, to be also the Body of Jesus Christ; and therefore they so often say, that the Bread is, not the Figure of the Body, but the Body, not the Figure of the Flesh, but the Flesh it self, because the Lord did not say, this is the Figure of my Body, but this is my Body. Whereunto relates that saying of *Theophilact*, we already cited, which is, *we must not be troubled to believe Bread is Flesh*.

III. 'TIS likewise to keep this pretended literal sense, that they would have the Bread to be made one with the Body by its Union to the Divinity, by the impression of the Holy Spirit, and by a change of virtue. And therefore they bring the comparison of Food, which becomes one with our Bodies; and invented this way of *Growth* or *Augmentation* of a natural Body: for all this ends only in establishing a Unity between the Bread, and the Body, which may make us say literally, and without recourse to a Figure, that the Bread is the Body. As to what concerns us, we need not take such a great circuit, because the Question, concerning a Sacrament, we believe we may take the Words of Christ in a sacramental and figurative sense.

IV. IT seems likewise, that the Modern *Greeks* understand some real or physical impression, of the Holy Spirit, and invivifying virtue of Jesus Christ, on the Bread, with some kind of inherency; yet I will not positively affirm this was the general Belief of their Church, altho their expressions intimate as much. But howsoever, this is not our Opinion. We do indeed believe, that the Grace of the Holy Spirit, and virtue of Christ's Body, accompany the right use of the Sacrament, and that in the Communion we participate of the Body of Christ by Faith in as great a measure; and more really than if we received him with the Mouth of our Bodies; but we hold not this impression, or real inherence of virtue, which it seems the *Greeks* admit; whence



whence it happens that our expressions are not so emphatical as theirs.

AND this is what I had to say touching the real Opinion of the *Greeks*, with its principal Circumstances, and in reference to that of ours, and the Church of *Rome's*. I do not doubt but several People reading this Chapter, will say, I charge the *Greeks* with a very foolish and unreasonable Doctrine. They make Objections touching this composition of Bread and Holy Spirit, this Union of the Symbols with the Divinity, and especially concerning this manner of being the Body and Blood of Christ, by way of Growth or Augmentation. But to this I need say no more, than that it concerns me not to justify the Opinion of the *Greeks*. Our business here is to know what it is, and not whether it be justifiable, nor to answer the Objections may be made against it, because we adopt not either their Expressions or Opinions. Yet I shall endeavour to solve two difficulties, which may trouble the Readers; the one is, that according to the Hypothesis of the *Greeks*, it seems as if it might be said in some sense, that the Bread is changed into the Substance of the Body of Jesus Christ, after the same manner we say the Bread we eat is changed into our Substance. The other is, that by this Union of Bread to the Divinity, it seems they understand a real hypostatical Union, like unto that which joyns the natural Body to the Word.

TO the first I answer, the *Greeks* mean not the Bread receives the natural or physical form of the Flesh of Christ, as we have proved; neither do they say, the Bread is changed into the Substance of the Body of Christ, because this way of speaking, which we use in respect of the Bread we eat is grounded upon the Food's receiving the Substantial or physical form of our Flesh. Now they mean no other impression on the Bread in the *Eucharist*, than an impression of the invivifying virtue of Christ's Body by means of the Holy Spirit. And thus the Bread keeps its proper and natural Substance wholly intire, and yet is augmented by an Augmentation of the Body of Christ, inasmuch as the supernatural virtue which is proper to this Body is communicated to the Bread. As to what remains, altho this pretended Augmentation of the Body of Jesus Christ, by means of the Bread is absurd enough, yet we may give it a plain sense, in saying 'tis not necessary for this that the Bread and Body be locally joyned, it being sufficient to conceive the Holy Spirit is the mutual link which unites them together, and the Bread receiving only the virtue of the Body, by a dependance thereon, and inasmuch as 'tis the Mystery of it, this is a kind of Growth and Augmentation, a Mystery being as it were an Appendix, or Circumstance to the thing of which 'tis the Mystery.

TO the second Question, I answer, that altho the whole Hypothesis of the *Greeks*, and especially some of their expressions, seem to induce us to attribute to 'em the Belief of the hypostatical Union of Bread to the Divinity, yet their Authors not plainly expressing themselves in this matter, and it not appearing elsewhere by their practice, that they hold this Opinion, there is more justice in not charging them with it, than in imputing it to 'em, and so much the more, because there is none of their usual expressions, how emphatical soever, but may agree with a simple Union of efficacy. The Term of Assumption used by *Damascen*, *Panis & Vinam*, *ὑπολαμβάνεται*, *assumantur*, induced me to believe at first with Mr. *Aubertin*, he meant thereby a real hypostatical Assumption, but having since carefully examined this Passage, it seemed to me this *ὑπολαμβάνεται*, may be easily referred not to the foregoing Words

Words in the same Discourse, but to that which follows in the simple sence; *That the Bread and Wine are used in the Eucharist, because they are things familiar to us.*

BUT howsoever, we may here observe, that ever since both *Greeks* and *Latins* deviated from the simplicity of the Gospel, and natural Exposition, which the Ancients gave this Mytery; how they have fallen, I say, into vain and idle Speculations, both of 'em wandering from the Truth. Which commonly happens to such as love rather to follow their own imaginations, than the Word of God. Our Saviour tells us concerning the Sacrament, that 'tis his Body, and added, that it was for a remembrance of him; and Saint *Paul* thus commented on it, This is a Declaration of the Lord's death till his coming. What could be more easie than to keep here, and to judge thereof by the very nature of a Sacrament, by the expressions of our Saviour, and his Apostle, and other parts of Christian Religion? But instead of this, we have abused several excessive expressions of the Fathers, taking no notice of divers others, by which they explain themselves; these have been extended, and altho innocent, yet are made a Rock of Offence. The *Latins* proceed to a real Presence, a real Transubstantiation, and Accidents without a Subject, and all the rest of those Doctrines unknown to the Ancients, which they heap up without number. The *Greeks* on their side have imagined a Union of the Bread with the Divinity, a kind of real impression of supernatural virtue of Christ's Body on the Bread, a Growth, or Augmentation of this Body.

I hope I shall have this Justice done me, that it will be acknowledged, I have produced nothing touching the Doctrine of the *Greeks*, but what has been taken out of their best Authors, from them I say that are of greatest account amongst them. And 'tis in fine from their proper Testimonies, I have clearly shown, that that which the *Greeks* hold touching the *Eucharist*, is not the Transubstantiation of the *Latins*; which is the chief and only thing I had to do. Yet shall I answer in the following Book all Mr. *Arnaud's* vain Objections; as briefly as I can; for considering what I already established, 'tis easie to judge, that his Arguments will not prove invincible Demonstrations, as he would persuade the World.





## BOOK IV.

## Mr. Arnaud's Proofs touching the Belief of the Greek Church refuted.

## CHAP. I.

*Mr. Arnaud's First Proof, taken from Cerularius his Silence, examined. The rest of his Illusions discovered.*

**A**FTER what I have established in the two former Books, it will be no difficult matter, to answer, Mr. *Arnaud's* Objections, and shew as I promised, that all his endeavours to demonstrate the Greek Church ever believed Transubstantiation are ineffectual, and that the greatest part of his Proofs conclude the contrary of what he pretends. And this shall be the subject of this Book. Which I shall divide into two Parts; in the first, I shall examine what Mr. *Arnaud* has alledged, to prove his supposition since the Eleventh Century to this present; and in the second, consider what he has alledged for the same purpose from the Seventh, Eighth, Ninth and Tenth Centuries.

IN the first Part of this Book, I shall handle four principal Heads, under which I shall exactly gather whatsoever Mr. *Arnaud* has dispersed in his Second, Third, and Fourth Books, and part of his Twelfth Book, wherein he has treated on some Particulars, respecting this Question.

OUR first Remark shall be touching some of Mr. *Arnaud's* Delusions, besides those we already discovered, in the former Books. It is certain we may justly so term all the Parts of his Work, but more especially, what he has written touching the *Greeks*; for 'tis all delusory. But at present we mean to apply this Term to certain things only, wherein his Artifice plainly appears, and which are wholly inconsistent with that sincerity, wherewith Controversies ought to be managed.

THE second Head contains the Testimonies of some Protestants, whom Mr. *Arnaud* has alledged; which seem in effect to attribute to the *Greeks* the Belief of Transubstantiation.

THE Third, shall contain the Negative Arguments, drawn from the Silence of both *Greeks*, and *Latins*; that is to say, they never disputed one against another, on this Article, of the Conversion of Substances in the *Eucharist*.

IN the Fourth, we shall explain, all the Passages Mr. *Arnaud* has taken out of Greek Authors, and from which he would infer by dint of Argument, that the *Greeks* hold this Conversion of Substances.

Lib. 2. cap. 5.  
Pag. 139.

TO begin at his Delusions, the First, or to speak better, the Twelfth, (after those we already discovered) consists, in that he would have us upon the account of his own bare word, without any Proof, suppose, that when *Michael Cerularius*, Patriarch of *Constantinople*, and *Leo* Archbishop of *Acrida*, wrote their Letter against the Church of *Rome*, *Leo* the Ninth, the then present Pope had already condemned *Berengarius*; and that the *Greeks* could not be ignorant of this censure. But 'twill not be amiss to hear him speak himself, *To shew*, say's he, *the consent of the Greek Church with the Roman, in the Subject of the Eucharist; we have made use (in the refutation of Mr. Claude's Answer) of the contest which arose in the year 1053. between Michael Cerularius, Patriarch of Constantinople, and Leo Archbishop of Acrida on one hand, and Pope Leo the Ninth, and the whole Latine Church on the other. For these Persons altho such passionate adversaries against the Western Church, upon the account of the Azymes, yet never reproached her as erring in the Mystery of the Eucharist; altho they wrote against the Latins, AT THE SAME TIME, AND AFTER, Pope Leo had censured Berengarius, in two Councils of Italy, the one held at Rome, th' other at Verfeil; whence we conclude they were agreed with the Latin Church in the Doctrine of the real Presence, which she so loudly asserted at that time.* This is Mr. *Arnaud's* first Proof, which he has set forth to the life, in the best colours wherewith his Eloquence could furnish him; having turned it several wayes by his usual dexterity, in amplifying, and exaggerating the Subjects he handles.

IT is certain that to make this Argument valid, he must clearly establish before all things, that, *Berengarius* his Condemnation preceded *Cerularius*, and *Leo* of *Acrida's* Letter, and preceded it to, a very considerable time; to shew that these Prelates were well informed of it, and had reason to mention it in their Letter; for without this, we can conclude nothing from their Silence. Yet Mr. *Arnaud* has not troubled himself with the clearing up this matter of Fact; contenting himself in saying only, that *Cerularius*, and *Leo* of *Acrida* wrote against the *Latins* at the same time, and a little after Pope *Leo* condemned *Berengarius*, in two Councils of *Italy*. A man would then think, this was a Point out of doubt, and at which Mr. *Arnaud* has no need to stop a moment, having judged it evident (beyond contradiction) in his Chronology. But he will be much startled to find, there is nothing more uncertain, than his supposition; and moreover, that there is nothing more unlikely than what he say's.

TO be ascertained in this Matter, we must know, that *Cerularius*, and *Leo* of *Acrida's* Letter was written in the Year, 1053. as Mr. *Arnaud* and all the World grants. We must moreover know, that although *Baronius*, and *Binius* attribute the two Condemnations of *Berengarius*, to the Year, 1050. 3 Years before *Cerularius* his Letter was written, yet there are Authors that are better informed in this Matter than *Baronius*, and *Binius*; who refer these two Condemnations to the Year 1053. being exactly the same Year wherein the Letter was written. And these are such Authors, whose Testimony will go far with Mr. *Arnaud*. Being those that published the Office of the *B. Sacrament*, that is to say, this same Office, to which, the first Treatise of the *Perpetuity*, in its primary Design, was to serve as a Preface; as we

a Preface; as we have been already twice informed. Observe here, what they say, *Neither Malmesbury, nor Baronius, have exactly observed all the Councils, which were called touching this Heresie of Berengarius. The first of them, was held at Rome, by Pope Leo the Ninth; the second at Verfeil, in the Month of September, in the same Year, under the same Pope. We cannot doubt, (after the Testimony of Lanfranc) in his Book against Berengarius, but that these two Councils were held both in the same Year. But some, (as Baronius and Binius) will have this Year to be 1050. others the Year, 1053. First, because Sigibert say's, that Pope Leo held two Councils, in 1050. but he immediately observes likewise this was only to reform the abuses of the Ecclesiasticks; and speaks not of the Troubles raised by Berengarius his Heresie, but only as hapning in the Year, 1051. Secondly, because Durand Abbot of Trovand in Normandy, who lived about that time, refers the Council of Verfeil, to the Year 1053. only. And there is no reason to pretend, as a Learned Lawyer of Angers does, that there is a mistake, in this Passage of Durand; and that we must read 1050. seeing that according to the judicious Observation of Mr. de St. Beuve, the King's Professor at Sorbortine; in a Manuscript on this Matter, the same Durand testifies, that in the Year he speaks of, Alired was Abbot of the Abby of Preaux in Normandy, which was not founded till the Year 1053. according to Du Bec's Chronicle.*

Office of the  
B. Sacrament,  
Hist. and  
Chron. 11.  
Cent.

HERE then we have upon good Grounds, and undeniable Authority, the two Condemnations of *Berengarius*, referred to the same Year, in which *Cerularius*, and *Leo of Acrida* wrote their Letter. It remains only to know, whether Mr. *Arnaud* may suppose without Proof, that the Letter was written after *Berengarius* his Condemnation; and whether 'tis not a plain Delusion, thus slightly to pass over a Point of this importance, on which depends the greatest part of his reasoning. For, if this Letter was written, before the time wherein *Berenger* was first condemned; what can be then concluded from *Cerularius*, and *Leo de Acrida*'s Silence? Wherefore must they ground an Accusation, against the Church of *Rome*, on a Condemnation which was not then in being. Now this is a matter of Fact, which I affirm to be very uncertain; and which Mr. *Arnaud* must demonstrate, and not suppose, without Proof. They wrote, say's he, against the Latins, at the same time, and a little after, Pope Leo had condemned *Berengarius*, in two Councils of Italy, the one held at *Rome*, th' other at *Verfeil*. There being but one Letter, from both *Cerularius*, and *Leo de Acrida*; we must conceive, 'twas written to the Council at *Rome*, after *Berengarius* his first Condemnation; and near the time they were about calling th' other Council at *Verfeil*. Now this has no likelihood, for as *Baronius* has well observed, *Leo* answered this Letter in the same Year, namely, 1053. whence it follows, if we reckon right, we shall find, that *Cerularius*, and *Leo de Acrida* could not have written their Letter, but in the beginning of the Year, at farthest, and consequently before there was any mention at *Rome* of *Berengarius* his Condemnation; and especially before the news thereof came to *Constantinople*. In effect it must not be imagined, that this Patriarch, and Archbishop, indited their Letter without mature and deliberate advice, and consideration, nor that they sent it without communicating the Contents of it to some of their Clergy, to bring them to take part with them, and engage 'em in their Interests; seeing the matter concerned the censuring of a Church, such as that of the *Latins*, and which, they were sure would highly resent it; Affairs of this importance are not wont to be precipitated. It required also some time, before this Letter could come from *Constantinople*, to *Tranys* in the Kingdom of *Naples*. *John* Bishop of *Tranys*, to whom 'twas directed, must likewise

Baron ann.  
Eccles. ad  
ann. 1053.



Baron. ad  
ann. 1053.

infr. de corp.  
sang. Dum.

have some time, to send it to Cardinal *Humbert*, and he, must get it translated out of Greek into *Latin*. *Humbert* must go to *Rome*, for he carried it himself to Pope *Leo*, after he received it from the Bishop of *Trany*. In fine, *Leo* must examine it, and answer it; For all which Mr. *Arnaud* allows but three Months. *Cerularius*, say's he, and *Leo* of *Acrida*, wrote against the *Latins*, and at the same time, and not long after again, Pope *Leo* condemned *Berengarius*, in two Councils of *Italy*, the one held at *Rome*, th' other at *Verfeil*. This not long after, can only relate to the Council at *Rome*, which was the first, and consequently this, at the same time, must relate to the Council of *Verfeil*, which being not called till *September*, as appears by *Lanfranc*, who positively affirmeth it; and the Pope having wrote his Answer at farthest in *December*, it must needs be, (if we believe what Mr. *Arnaud* supposes) that is to say, if the Letter was written in the Month of *September*, that all that which I come now from observing, was transacted in three Months time. And thus does Mr. *Arnaud* hasten the time, that it may answer his necessities.

TO this Delusion, we may add another, which will be the Thirteenth. It consists in supposing, without Proof, that *Leo* the Ninth in condemning *Berengarius*, precisely established Transubstantiation, and the real Presence. For if we take not this Fact for a certain Principle, there can be no Pretence for demanding, wherefore *Cerularius* reproached not the Church of *Rome*, about her erring in the Doctrine of the *Eucharist*.

YET is there nothing more uncertain, for, there are none of the Decrees of this Council extant, and I think not one Author that relates the proper Terms of these Condemnations. They tell us, that *Berengarius* was condemned, that *Fohn Scot's* Book was burnt, but this is not sufficient to conclude, that Transubstantiation, and the real Presence were established, in Terms which might offend *Cerularius*, and the *Greeks*, and give them occasion to form an Accusation against the Roman Church. Sober men are not wont to accuse People upon confused Reports, and equivocal Terms. And it will be to no purpose to say, we must not doubt, but that *Leo's* intention was, to assert the substantial Conversion, against *Berengarius*; seeing *Lanfranc* assures us, that he himself having declared in full Council his Belief touching the *Eucharist*, in opposition to that of *Berengarius*, it was approved, and the other rejected as erroneous. For he that states an Opinion contradictory to that of *Berengarius*, does not necessarily assert Transubstantiation, there being several other ways and means of opposition. It concerns us not here to inform our selves from *Lanfranc*, what was the sence of the Synod, but whether what came to *Cerularius* his knowledge concerning that matter was sufficient to make him say, those People established a real Conversion of Substances. Now to imagine, as Mr. *Arnaud* does, that a Patriarch which is at *Constantinople*, can make such a Judgment with Discretion, it will not be sufficient to inform him of the intention and secret design of the *Latins* (altho even this is not to be supposed without Proof) but he must have before him the distinct and exprefs Terms relating to this Affair, and this Mr. *Arnaud* cannot prove, seeing there is no such matter extant.

HE will say without doubt, that this is a very strange thing (for whatsoever falls not under his sence is *strange*) to affirm that a Pope and Council that intended to establish Transubstantiation in condemning *Berengarius*, yet have not done it in intelligible Terms. Neither will he forget to censure me here a little (as he is wont at every pinch) saying, *I consider the matters I*  
write

write in a superficial view only; not penetrating into the bottom of things; and that occasions my falling into such idle fancies; that I multiply my may-be's; and am one of the boldest and fruitfulest men in the World, in Hypotheses and Systems. To which I have nothing to answer, but that in the Year, 1059. Baron. ad ann. 1059. six years after the Synods held by Pope Leo, Nicholas the Second, condemned likewise Berengarius, in another Synod held at Rome, and made him sign a Formulary of Abjuration, and that according to Lanfranc, they earnestly desired to establish the real Conversion of Substances in this Formulary; that Cardinal Humbert, who drew it up, did firmly believe this Doctrine, as Mr. Arnaud protests for him; and yet for all this, it was asserted only in ambiguous Terms, which might be expounded in a sense that does not at all contradict the Doctrine of the Greeks; seeing Berengarius himself turned them to his own advantage. And in effect, the Formulary bears, *That the Bread and Wine are after Consecration, not only the Sacrament, but likewise the real Body and Blood of Jesus Christ; and are sensibly touched and broken by the Priest's hands, and chewed with the teeth of the Faithful; not only sacramentally, but really and in truth.* Lanfr. de corp. & sang. Dum. lib. 2. cap. 5. pag. 144. It cannot be denied, but these words need a Commentary to make them signify Transubstantiation; seeing the natural sense of them is, that those very things which are Bread and Wine, are also the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, which is the Opinion of the Greeks, as I already shewed in the foregoing Chapter. How comes it to pass, that what was done under Nicholas, was not done likewise under Leo, who preceded him; and wherefore were the Terms of Leo more expressive and determinative than those of the Pope that came after him? Is it the Custom in the Court of Rome to recede from, and diminish Doctrines? But howsoever, if Mr. Arnaud will make advantage of Cerularius his Silence, he must shew us, that Leo decided the Doctrine of Transubstantiation in such Terms, that the Patriarch of Constantinople could not, when he saw them, expound them in another sense. But to suppose this without proving it, is a mere Illusion.

SO far is Mr. Arnaud from shewing us that this formal decision was carried to Cerularius, that he does not so much as undertake to inform us whether the Decrees of these Synods at Rome and Versail (be they what they will) came to the hands of this Patriarch. He contents himself with saying, *That it had been already eighteen years since Berengarius his Heresie, became famous in the World; that Dedowin the Bishop of Liege, and Adelman Bishop of Bresse testifie, that the report of it o'respread all Germany; and that there is no likelihood, but the Latins at Constantinople, and the Greeks in Italy were informed of it, and that a Patriarch should be ignorant of so famous an occurrence.* Lib. 2. cap. 5. pag. 144.

FIRST, he has forgot what his Friends observed in their Office, that Sigibert speaks not of the troubles Berengarius his Heresie raised, till 1051. which is to say, that his eighteen years must be reduced to two, even by his own Friends consent. And as to what he say's of Dedowin, 'tis true, his Letter produced by Baronius under the name of Durand, has these Words, *That there was a common report throughout all Germany; that Bruno Bishop of Arras and Berengarius renewed the Ancient Heresies, in teaching that the Body of Jesus Christ, was not so much a Body as a Shadow and a Figure; and that they annulled the Sacrament of Marriage, and that of Baptism of Infants.* And this was it according to this good Bishop, which disturbed all Germany: As to Adelman he expresses himself more to the purpose, for he say's, *the report was, that Berengarius deviated from the Catholick Faith, touching the Body* Baron. lib. 2. and

and Blood of our Lord; and to use the words of those that accused him, they said, he taught the Sacrament was not the real Body and Blood, but a Figure or resemblance of them. Does Mr. Arnaud believe, that these Reports, when they should come even to Cerularius his ears, were capable of making him take the Field in favour of Berengarius? On one hand they represented his Doctrine in Terms very different from the usual expressions of the Greeks; which assert the Bread to be the real Body of Jesus Christ, and not a Figure; and on the other hand he had things laid to his charge, which were mere Falsities and Calumnies. Why will he needs have a Patriarch that was always at Constantinople, and held little or no communication with the Latins; to know better what Berengarius did in France, than Dedowin Bishop of Liège; or Adelman, who had been Berengarius his School fellow, and who by this long acquaintance might have some interest in his Affairs? Why must it needs be that during these pretended eighteen years, Cerularius has been better informed by his Spies or Inquisitors, than the Pope by his? For it does not appear that the Court of Rome concerned themselves at the matter till 1053. which is as we observed the same year in which Cerularius wrote his Letter. Nay 'tis probable they had not so soon taken notice of it, had not an Ecclesiastick of Rheims brought along with him to Rome some Letters which Berengarius wrote to Lanfranc. If the Popes remained silent eighteen years, notwithstanding this great disturbance in the West, I see no reason why a Patriarch of Constantinople should be any more concerned. I could wish Mr. Arnaud would tell us, why since the year 1053. (to which Baronius refers the Letters of Dedowin and Adelman) Bennet the Ninth, Gregory the Sixth, Clement the Second, Damasus the Second, have taken no notice of so considerable a matter; and why Leo the Ninth concerned not himself in it, till the fifth year of his Popedom. All Italy was full of French and Dutch, France and Germany of Italians, and yet no body all this while could think of waking these sleepy Popes; and cautioning them against this damnable Heresie; which overthrew the Faith of the whole Earth. Let him tell us, why the Patriarchs, that preceded Cerularius, or Cerularius himself reproached them not with this scandalous neglect: For if on one hand they believed Transubstantiation, as Mr. Arnaud supposes; and on the other, that there was nothing else almost talkt of in the West, and being so probable, that the Patriarchs of Constantinople were informed of so famous an occurrence, how came they to be so mute in such an important Affair, and prodigious neglect of the Popes? Of this he must give us an account, before he can require a reason of us, for Cerularius his silence. But to speak plainly, Mr. Arnaud devises matters in his Closet, and having clothed them with all the rhetorical colours, wherewith the power of his invention can furnish him, he delivers them to us as the exact Rules of humane Actions; without considering, that what he offers agrees no better with his own Hypothesis than ours. But be it as it will, he makes it not appear, that the Acts of the Synods at Rome and Versail came to Cerularius his hands, that he might make a right Judgment of them; and this is one of his illusions, for how can he expect we should satisfy him touching the Conduct of this Patriarch, if he does not before-hand shew us, that Cerularius had all necessary information, to make a right Judgment concerning Berengarius his Affair.

Answer to the  
second Treatise  
of the Perpetuity  
part. 3.  
chap. 8.

I answered the Author of the Perpetuity; That 'tis possible, Cerularius knew nothing of what passed in France under Leo the Ninth, touching Berengarius; or if he did, the account given him might be very confused and imperfect. And that 'tis likewise possible, matters might be misrepresented to him; and Berengarius



berengarius charged with that which was not his Doctrine. Mr. Arnaud to avoid the force of this Answer, turns it into ridicule. Mr. Claude, say's he, *must make the best advantage he can of his may-be-so's. He thinks he has sufficiently acquitted himself by these three may-be-so's, &c.* I am not troubled at Mr. Arnaud's diverting himself; but I am not willing the truth should suffer prejudice thereby. Had he been willing to examine seriously my Answer, he could not but find I meant, that the Argument drawn from Cerularius his Silence, could not be conclusive, till these three things are shewed us; First, That he knew what passed in France; Secondly, That he had a more certain and distinct knowledge thereof, than a meer flying report could furnish him with; And Thirdly, That Berengarius his Doctrine was truly represented to him. In effect, if either of these three things be wanting, the Argument drawn from Cerularius his Silence is invalid. There was no great reason than for charging my Answer with Drollery, and affirming *my Hypotheses to be fantastical, and that I use too often my priviledge of supposing.* For thus does he shrowd the absurdity of his Answers under two or three lines of pitiful raillery. The matter concerns not my Suppositions; but those of the Author of the *Perpetuity*. For this Author's Argument is grounded on these three Suppositions, already mentioned; not one of which he either does, or can prove: 'Tis he then and Mr. Arnaud that argue on groundless imaginations. Whence have they this priviledge of establishing their Arguments on uncertain matters of fact, or what can hinder me from calling their unproved Suppositions *meer may-be-so's*? I have not used this expression, but seeing Mr. Arnaud imputes it to me, I see no ill conveniency in adopting it; *may be* then Cerularius knew nothing of what past in Berengarius his Affair; *may be* he had only a general and confused account of it; *it may be* Berengarius his Doctrine was misrepresented to him. When Mr. Arnaud shall put these three *may be's* out of doubt, he shall see what answer we will make him, but till then I shall have reason to say, that his Proof is grounded on chimerical Suppositions.

B U T, say's he, *the Question being once opened, there could be no mistake about it. For every one knew the Catholicks held the real Body of Christ, was present in the Eucharist; and that Berenger denied this.* First, the Question was so little known, that it came not to the ears of four following Popes, or at least they pretended not to have heard of it. Moreover, granting it to be as publicly known as he pretends it was, yet People might be as well deceived in Italy and Constantinople, as at Liège; where Dedomin was grossly mistaken. In the third place, who told him, 'twas then held, that Christ's real Body was present in the Eucharist, and not rather that the Bread of the Eucharist was Christ's real Body? This was the Language of Nicholas, and his Bishops six years after; why was it not likewise that of Leo and his Church: 'Tis not likely Mr. Arnaud should know better the Style of those times, than the Roman Church her self, assembled in full Council, in the year 1059. *Every one, say's he, knew.* It seems to hear him thus speak, as if this particular had been proclaimed in every corner of the Streets, and was the common matter of Entertainment; all other business over the whole World being suspended and laid aside; and only that of Berengarius his contest attended to. Mr. Arnaud falls into the same humour, as those that have Quarrels or Law-Suits, for they thinking of nothing else both Day and Night; it seems to them, that others are concerned in like manner as they. His mind at present is so taken up with the Thoughts of Transubstantiation, the real Presence, and Berengarius his Controversie; that he imagines both East and West

were

were in the same manner affected with it then, and that the Echoes of it were heard throughout the whole World. But this is a meer fancy. There is in the World almost an infinite number of little Worlds (if I may so say) which divide and multiply themselves according to the number and difference of Professions and Interests. Every Affair makes a noise in its Circle; yet there are scarcely any but Historians, and some curious People, that inform themselves in each particular circumstance of Affairs, wherein they are not personally concerned; and yet they are often deceived in these Matters. I confess indeed Matters of Religion, are usually more publickly known than other things; but besides that they require time for this, it is moreover certain that these reports have their bounds in respect of places, and that sometimes they shall make a great noise in one Country, and yet be little or not at all heard of in another. We may presume this Affair of *Berengarius* was of this number; for after the Letters of *Dedonin* and *Adelman*, there passed eighteen years; as we have seen, without any mention of it in the Court of *Rome*; neither is there, as I know of, any Greek Author that takes notice of it. If, what Mr. *Arnaud* supposes touching this great report, which passed over from *Italy* to *Greece*, was true, the silence of all the Greek Authors would be every whit as astonishing as that of *Cerularius*. For why should not they mention it, being as much interested as the *Latins* in *Berengarius* his Condemnation; supposing they believed Transubstantiation? Why did they not complain of the Church of *Rome*'s so long bearing with him, or do the said Church so much right as to commend it for suppressing him? *Peter* the Patriarch of *Antioch* held at that time a correspondence with the then Pope, he wrote to him, and defended the *Latins* against the reproaches of the *Greeks*, as appears by his Letter to *Cerularius*; yet mentions not a word of this Condemnation, altho this offered it self very pertinently to shew the care the Church of *Rome* took to preserve Orthodoxy, and stifle Heresies, supposing the Eastern People believed Transubstantiation.

Lib. 2. cap. 5.  
pag. 143.

MR. *Arnaud* finding *Berengarius* his Affair would not do his Business, betakes himself to another Artifice. It concerns us not to know, say's he, whether *Cerularius*, and *Leo D'Acrida* could be ignorant of *Berengarius* his Condemnation. Yet this was the Author of the *Perpetuitie*'s Chief Argument, But, whether they could be ignorant of the Opinion of the whole *Latin Church* touching the Eucharist, which was then by the *Calvinists* own Confession most clear, distinct, and determinate for the real Presence. But let the Matter concern what it will, his Proof will be never the better. But instead of saying, for the real Presence, he should say, for Transubstantiation; for our Question touching the *Greeks*, being only on this Point, if Mr. *Arnaud* will make advantage of *Cerularius*, and *Leo d'Acrida*'s silence, he must establish that the *Latins* made it then an Article of their Belief. There is a great deal of ambiguity in these Terms of real Presence, the *Greeks* do, and do not believe it, they believe as we already observed, a real Presence of Virtue, but not a real Presence of Substance. And even we our selves, who deny the real Presence Mr. *Arnaud* means, profess to believe another, which we hold not only for real, but a thousand times more real than that which Mr. *Arnaud* intends. If then he designed to explain himself clearly and to the purpose, he must say, that the Opinion of the whole *Latine Church* was plainly and distinctly for Transubstantiation.

BUT 'tis not enough to say so, it must be proved, for endless and impertinent Stories will never satisfy our Reason. He tells us, that *Cerularius* having

having sent his Letter, caused the Latin Churches at Constantinople to be shut up, and took away from the Latin Abbots; and other Religious Persons their Monasteries. That in the following year, Pope Leo sent Cardinal Humbert, and the Bishop of Blanche Selve, and the Archbishop of Melphus in quality of his Legats to Constantinople, with Letters to both the Emperour and Patriarch. Which is no more than what we know already without Mr. Arnaud's telling us.

HE adds, That Humbert wrote a refutation of Cerularius his Letter by way of Dialogue, and amongst the rest, that the Azyme is made by invocation of the Trinity, the real and individual Body of Christ. There are so many faults to be reprehended in this Allegation, that a man scarce knows where to begin to refute it. Were his Translation as it should be, it would appear these words do not so clearly assert Transubstantiation, as to give Cerularius an occasion to reproach the Latins with it. For may we not understand that the Bread is made the real and individual Body of Christ, in as much as he has not two Bodies, but one, only? in the same sense Saint Chrysostom say's, that although the nature of Bread remains even then when it becomes worthy to be called our Lord's Body; Yet do we not say, that the Son of God has two Bodies, but one. And in the same sense Damascen say's, also, That when the Bread and Wine pass into the growth of our Lord's Body and Blood, it becomes not two Bodies but one. Moreover Humbert say's not what Mr. Arnaud makes him say, viz. that the Bread becomes the Individual Body, his words are, Corpus Singulare, the Singular Body, that is to say, the Body which singly and only belongs to Jesus Christ, and not to the Father and Holy Spirit; and there is so great blindness, or rather unfaithfulness in this Translation, that I cannot suppose it to be Mr. Arnaud's. He has published it without doubt from the Collection of some of his Friends, and not from Humbert's Text; For how great soever his prejudice may be; I do not believe he would venture his reputation for so small an advantage as might be expected from this false Translation. Observe here what Humbert say's, The Azyme being thus prepared, is made by an hearty Invocation of the Holy Trinity, the real and single Body of Christ. Not as the Theopaschites would have it, the Body of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Which it seems you believe likewise, seeing you say the Azyme does not participate of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. as the Leavened Bread does. Leave this wicked Opinion, unless you will be condemned with the Theopaschites. In the Commemoration of our Lord's Passion, the Holy and Impassible Trinity has nothing in common except the single Consecration, wherein all the Persons co-operate: For the death of the Humanity only of the Son of God is celebrated in this visible Sacrament, the Apostle saying, every time ye eat of this Bread, and drink of this Cup, ye shew the Lord's death till he comes. Our Lord himself in this particular Commemoration, delivering the Bread to his Disciples, said to em, this is my Body which was given for you. Mine, say's he, which by the Grace of the Holy Spirit, I who am the Wisdom of the Father, have built as a Temple in 45 days, in the Womb of the unspotted Virgin. It now plainly appears what is the meaning of this Singular Corpus Christi, which is to say, the Body which the second Person only assumed, and not the Father, nor Holy Spirit. To make of this the individual Body of Jesus Christ, to conclude from thence Transubstantiation, is so gross and ridiculous a mistake, that had Mr. Arnaud met with the like in my Writings; in the humour he seems to be of, he would have made it the Subject of a whole Chapter. I shall only advise him to take more care another time; and not labour so confidently hereafter upon other Peoples Memories. This first Passage is attended by another almost of the same kind. He say's, say's he,



that the Latins honouring the Body of Truth, that is to say, the Body of Christ, made of an Azyne, and in the Azyne, taste with their Mouths and Heart how sweet the Lord is. This, adds he, is clear enough, and a man must be very dull, not to understand this Language. I confess I am not quicker of apprehension than another, yet I understand very well Humbert's Discourse without Transubstantiation. We say, say's he, that the Azyne of the Christians is very different from that of the carnal Jews, who observed and pursued the shadow of Truth, invited hereunto by the promise, and desire of a Terrestrial Felicity, such as a long Life, Riches, a numerous Offspring, and such like things. But as to us, honouring and retaining the Body of Truth, which is of the Azyne, and in the Azyne we taste with our mouths and heart, how sweet the Lord is, desiring of him no more, but that he may dwell in us, and we in him eternally. Is not this to deride People, to alledge such a Passage as this, whereby to establish Transubstantiation, and that so clearly too, that Cerularius ought to reproach the Latins with it? Had Mr. Arnaud minded, he might have comprehended that this Body of Truth, is nothing else but the Truth it self, which is called the Body in opposition to the Shadow of the Jews, that it is of the Azyne, and in the Azyne, because the Azyne is the Mystery of it, that in partaking of it with our mouths and hearts, we taste the sweetness of the Lord, because his Grace thereby is communicated to us, and that in fine this Truth, of which he speaks, is our Spiritual Communion with Christ; as he explains it himself, in saying, that he dwells in us, and we in him, in opposition to the Terrestrial Felicity, which the Jews expected in the participation of their Azyne.

MR. Arnaud adds that Humbert believed Transubstantiation; but it concerns us not to know whether he did believe it or not; but whether he did sufficiently explain it to the Greeks, whereby to move Cerularius to make it the head of an Accusation against the Roman Church.

THE Pope's Legats, say's he, excommunicated the Patriarch, and departed from Constantinople: I agree with him in this; The Patriarch would have them return to the end they might be torn in pieces by the People. This may be. He stirred up a Sedition against the Emperor that upheld them. I grant it. They sent the Emperor a true Copy of the Excommunication they had read, in which they say, that as to the Pillars of the Empire, and its Honourable and Sage Citizens, they were most Christian and Orthodox. All this concludes nothing. They blame not Cerularius in any sort touching the Eucharist; which shews they had not the least thought that Cerularius differed from them in his Opinion about this Mystery. Why must they blame him touching this Point, when both the Greeks and Latins at that time, used the same Expressions? Cerularius, say's he, afterwards, giving way to his Passion, wrote to the Patriarch of Antioch to animate him against the Latins; and makes no mention of their Belief touching the Eucharist. I believe it. But this still concludes nothing, unless it be shewed that Transubstantiation was then established in the Romane Church. This is the Point that ought to be proved, without any more words. For all these Narrations serve only to inform us, in what perplexity Mr. Arnaud finds himself to make out his first Proof. He carries his Readers backwards and forwards, from East to West, and from West to East again: when the Question concerns the Opinion of the Greeks, he goes to seek it at Rome, amongst the Latins: and when touching the Opinion of the Latins, he goes to seek it at Antioch and Constantinople amongst the Greeks; and all this amounts to nothing at last, but mere Delusion; for it proves nothing. Was ever such Confusion beheld in the entrance of a Controversie, and especially considering the noise there has been about it?

BUT

BUT it will be perhaps said; How can we deny that Transubstantiation was established, and commonly held by the Church of *Rome* in *Leo's* time; that is to say, about the middle of the Eleventh Century? I answer, we can be no otherwise informed, than by the Expressions of the Council held under *Nicholas II.* which I already related, and which contain not Transubstantiation. I believe there were then several particular Persons that believed it; and took this way whereby to explain how the Bread is made the Body of Christ; but howsoever the Roman Church had not yet declared her self otherwise than in general Terms; which could not offend either *Cerularius*, or his *Greeks*.

THIS is then another of *Mr. Arnaud's* Artifices, to persuade us as he would do, that he is not, moreover obliged to prove, the *Greeks* believed Transubstantiation, and that 'tis sufficient to shew, that all the Patriarchal Churches were linkt in Communion with the Roman, when she condemned *Berengarius*; and were not parted asunder upon this occasion; This, I say, is a gross Delusion, for not to mention here, that the Rupture was already made before the time of *Berengarius* his first Condemnation, or at least before his Condemnation could be known in the Patriarchal Churches, as appears by what I alledged in the beginning of this Chapter, we must further observe, that of all those Condemnations (which the Authors of the *Office* make to amount to Eight) there is never a one, but the last (which was made by *Gregory VII.* in the Year 1079.) which can be said to establish expressly, Transubstantiation; so that the Separation of the *Greeks* being made since the Year 1053. that is to say, Twenty six Years before, this Presumption (which *Mr. Arnaud* say's, is clearly on the side of the Roman Church) is void and fantastical, and cannot acquit him from giving us that Proof which we require of him.

## CHAP. II.

*Mr. Arnaud's Second Proof, taken from Cardinal Humbert's Dispute with Nicetas Pectoratus, examined. His Third Proof from the Testimony of Lanfranc, and Silence of the Berengarians examined. The rest of Mr. Arnaud's Delusions considered.*

**M**R. *Arnaud's* Second Proof taken from *Cardinal Humbert's* Dispute with *Nicetas Pectoratus*, consists of Delusions as well as the former. He immediately tells us, this Dispute, does invincibly prove these Four Points. 1. That the Roman Church held at that time the Doctrine of the real Presence and Transubstantiation. 2. That this Doctrine was declared to the *Greeks* in such a manner, that they could not be ignorant of it. 3. That *Cardinal Humbert* positively believed the *Greeks* held the Doctrines of the real Presence and Transubstantiation. 4. That the *Greeks* did in effect believe this Doctrine, and clearly expressed the same. But

having thus distinguished these Four Propositions, and assured us they are the plain result of *Humbert's* Dispute with *Nicetas*, his first Delusion consists in leaving them, and expressly proving neither of 'em. He contents himself with alledging to us a Passage of *Humbert's*, wherein there is not the least mention of the Conversions of Substances, nor so much as one Clause, but what is expressed in such Terms as may be well understood without Transubstantiation. Which will plainly appear, if we take the pains to read over again this Passage, as Mr. *Arnaud* has produced it, in the Sixth Chapter of his Second Book.

I confess, he endeavours to infer it thence by way of Consequence, *Be- Ibid. pag. 151.* cause, say's he, that *Humbert*, denying as he does, that the Eucharist is digested, and breaks the Ecclesiastical Fast, he can therefore acknowledge no other Substance, but that of Christ's Body.

BUT, besides that, this is not clearly to prove the Church of *Rome* then believed Transubstantiation, and that her Belief on this Point was declared to the *Greeks* in such a manner, that they could not be ignorant of it, but must perceive it to be the Consequence of *Humbert's* Terms, seeing on one hand we may still doubt whether *Humbert* spake his own Sense, or that of the Church which sent him, and so much the more, because Mr. *Arnaud* acknowledges this Cardinal was very hot in this Dispute, and on the other, 'tis very uncertain whether the *Greeks* went so far as this Consequence. Besides this, I say, the Consequence it self is neither demonstrative nor unavoidable; for it does not follow from a mans denying the Eucharist is digested, and breaks ones Fast, that he acknowledges no other Substance than that of the Body of Christ. He may believe, the Substance of Bread becomes incorruptible as soon as 'tis in the Stomach, and that it passes immediately without Digestion into our Substance, according to the Opinion of *Damasceus*, *Zonaras*, and almost all the Eastern Churches, as we shall see hereafter. For in *Humbert's* sense, all Food that breaks our Fast is digested, and passes into Excrements, as the common nourishments do. Whence I conclude that Mr. *Arnaud* deceives us, when he say's, this Dispute does invincibly prove the Roman Church then believed Transubstantiation, and that her Belief was sufficiently made known to the *Greeks*; for neither one nor the other of these do hence necessarily follow.

NEITHER can it be thence concluded she believed the real Presence, I mean this local and physical Presence of the proper Substance of the natural Body of Jesus Christ, as she does believe it at this day, nor that *Humbert* thought the *Greeks* believed it, and this Mr. *Arnaud's* last Consequence is moreover found defective, altho this is not the Point in question betwixt us. For supposing the Bread remaining Bread, becomes the Body of Christ by way of Augmentation of this Body, being united to the Divinity, and receiving by the Holy Spirit the impression of the inlivening virtue, which is Jesus Christ, according to the Sentiment of the *Greeks*, *Humbert* might (without being thought senseless or extravagant) tell *Nicetas* that in teaching the Eucharist breaks our fast, he exposed the Body of Jesus Christ to the condition of common Food. For altho on this Hypothesis, the Bread is not the Body of the Son of God in propriety of Substance, yet is it his Body in such a manner, that seems to exempt it from the quality of other Food; which is sufficient to occasion *Humbert's* Reproach, and render ineffectual all these little Subtilities of Mr. *Arnaud*.

I replied,



I replied, in my Answer to the Perpetuity, that this Dispute of *Humbert* and *Nicetas* furnished us wherewith to shew that, the *Greeks* did not believe the Transubstantiation of the *Latins*, forasmuch as *Nicetas* maintains therein that, the *Eucharist* breaks our Fast; which supposes it conserves its first nature of corporeal Aliment, and that, he believed it descends into the Stomach like other Food, which moreover shews, he held it still for real Bread: I strengthened this Proposition by the Testimony of *Humbert*, *Algerus*, and *Celso* the Jesuit. I added likewise that *Durand* Abbot of *Troarn*, tells us, that those heretofore called *Stercoranists* were the *Berengarians*, which is to say, those held the Bread keeps its first nature, and I confirmed my Proof by several weighty Considerations, as that it was not to be imagined men that were Christians would expose the proper Substance of the Son of God to these Accidents of Corporeal Food, that this Opinion would be inconsistent with that State of Glory, wherein we all believe it to be, as also with that Sacramental State wherein 'tis made to be in the *Eucharist*.

Answer to the  
second Treatise.

MR. *Arnaud* finding he could not establish his own Proof, applies himself to the refuting of mine, and immediately making use of his Privilege, he singles out what he pleases, and leaves the rest. He takes no notice of *Celso* the Jesuit's Testimony, for what reason he best knows. He passes over in silence what I said touching the State of Glory, wherein the Son of God now is, and so likewise what I mentioned concerning his Sacramental State. And from the remaining part of my Proof he is pleased to make this Argument. *The Greeks are Stercoranists according to Humbert and Algerus. The Stercoranists are Berengarians according to Durand. The Greeks then are Berengarians.* But seeing my Proof is to be modelled, I crave leave to take it out of his hands, and state it my self. Observe here then how I reasoned. Those that believe the *Eucharist* breaks our Fast, and give cause to charge them with *Stercoranism*, hold the Substance of Bread remains. But the *Greeks* believe the *Eucharist* breaks our Fast, and yield occasion to accuse them of *Stercoranism*. They hold then the Substance of Bread remains. And thus do I reason; but by misfortune Mr. *Arnaud* can neither deny the major, minor, nor Conclusion of this Argument. He was constrained therefore to new mould it, and then knew not how to give it a direct Answer.

Lib. 2. cap. 6.  
pag. 153.

IT is true, say's he, that *Humbert* charges *Nicetas* with believing the Body of Christ was digested; but this is only as a Consequence of what he offered, touching the *Eucharist's* breaking our Fast, and not as a Doctrine which he expressly asserted. It is all one to me whether he attributes to him this Opinion, either as a Doctrine or a Consequence, either of 'em being sufficient to establish the solidity of my Proof. Mr. *Arnaud* may dispute this Point with *Celso* or *Algerus*, it not lying upon me to prove it. When it should be true this Consequence were not well drawn from the Principle which *Nicetas* lays down from the part of the *Greeks*, and that the *Greeks* might reply thereunto, there would be still enough in the Principle it self, to make my Conclusion just and necessary. For those that absolutely and sincerely believe the *Eucharist* breaks our Fast, cannot but likewise believe that it nourishes after the manner of Food, which is to say, that it distributes it self through all the parts of our Body, being added to our Substance, and consequently that 'tis still real Bread. And it will be to no purpose to say, the *Greeks* might believe, That the troublesome of fasting is effectually eased thereby, and that we are really nourished, not with the Body of Christ, but by some other means known only to God.

lib 3 pag. 155.

Lib. 2. cap. 6.  
pag. 155.

Nicetas Con-  
tra Lat. Bibl.  
Patr. Tom. 4.  
Edit.

God. For there being in the *Eucharist* only the Substance and Accidents, those that believe 'tis in Substance the proper Body of Christ, and yet affirm it nourishes, must attribute this nourishment either to the Body of Christ, or to the Accidents. As to the Body of Christ, it is absurd to affirm that a Substance which exists after the manner of an invisible and insensible Spirit, can nourish our Bodies, that is to say, augment the Substance of them. And as to the Accidents, besides the absurdity there is in supposing Accidents alone nourish us, the *Greeks* know not what belongs to the existence of Accidents without a Subject, which Mr. Arnaud himself grants, when he say's, they trouble not themselves with these Philosophical Consequences. To affirm likewise, as Mr. Arnaud does, that the *Greeks*, perhaps only asserted the *Eucharist* broke our Fast, because they believed the Oblation of the Sacrifice, did not belong to the Fast, and that they were permitted to eat after they had communicated, is a mere Evasion, which plainly denotes Mr. Arnaud's perplexity. For the *Greeks* accuse the *Latins*, not for their eating so soon after the Communion in Lent, for this Accusation would be false and slanderous, seeing they know the contrary. But he accuses them in that they break their Fast, by receiving the *Eucharist*. Whence have you this Custom, say's Nicetas, to celebrate the Oblation of the Paschal Mass every day, even on the Holy days of fasting, as well as on Saturday and Sunday? What Doctors thus taught you? Were they the Apostles? No; For the Apostles made a Canon, to this effect, that if any Bishop, Priest, Deacon, Reader, or Chanter, that is in health, fasts not, on the Fridays and Saturdays in Lent, he ought to be degraded; Seeing then you celebrate Mass at nine of the Clock; which is the hour in which the Sacrifice is to be offered, how then keep you the Fast till three in the Afternoon, breaking it as you do, in the time of the Administration? You do not at all observe it, and therefore you are accused. It is plainly seen here the matter concerns the reception of the *Eucharist*, and that he means it breaks the Fast, for he say's they break it, in tempore ministrationis Missæ. Where then has Mr. Arnaud found this Evasion, that the *Greeks* say the *Eucharist* breaks the Fast, only because they believe, the Oblation of the Sacrifice does not belong to the Fast, and that it was lawful to eat after the participation of the Communion? This is, say's he, the conjecture of a very Learned man, who has taken the pains to read over this Treatise. Is Mr. Arnaud so tired with his Work, and his time so mightily taken up, that he cannot afford one half hour for the reading this Treatise himself, for it requires no more? These Anonymous Learned men do often deceive us with their Conjectures, and when a Person makes a Book which he designs to render famous throughout all Europe, in sending it to all the Courts in Christendom, it is absolutely requisite, not to trust all sorts of People. He say's in his Epistle Dedicatory to the Pope, that his Friends have laboured with him. In the Twelfth Book he gives us a Dissertation of a Religious man of Saint Genevieve on John Scot's Case, and that of Bertram. Moreover, he tells us, he has desired some Persons to translate for him, that Passage of Herbert's, about which we have made such a noise, here he gives us the conjecture of an Anonymous. I am afraid some indiscreet Person or other will judge hereupon, that Mr. Arnaud's whole Book is made up only of incoherent Fragments. As for my part I do not thus judge, but I wish Mr. Arnaud had rectified and digested himself, what others have furnished him with, and not been like the Sea in this particular, which receiving into its Womb all the Waters of Rivers, communicates only to them its brynnels.

HUMBERT never thought of giving any of these Sences, to the Passage

Passage proposed to us out of *Nicetas*. He never imagined that the *Greeks* believed the Communion breaks the Fast, either because they were permitted to eat immediately after, or because our Bodies receive the same impressions, and the same strength by receiving of the *Eucharist*, as by any other common Food. But he only understood they taught that the *Eucharist* does really nourish us, in the same manner, as other Food, which changes it self into our Substance, and 'tis thereupon that he grounded his charge of *Stercoranism*. Do Mr. *Arnaud* and his Anonymouses, know better now in *Paris* the true meaning of *Nicetas*, than *Humbert* who lived in that time, and was at *Constantinople* with this Religious, *Leo* the Ninth, having affirmed the *Latins* have the same Faith as the *Greeks*? Mr. *Arnaud* thereupon takes occasion to insult over me, and tells me, he will be judged by my self, *Whether 'tis likely* Lib. 2. cap. 56. pag. 141.  
*Leo that lived amongst the Greeks, did not know better than I their Opinion, who now come six hundred years after, assuring the World upon my own bare word of the contrary, without any Proof or Testimony.* And ten or twelve Pages further, he would persuade us, that *Humbert*, who was Contemporary with *Nicetas*, and in the same City with him, did not well comprehend *Nicetas* his meaning; and that himself, Mr. *Arnaud*, and Mr. his Anonymous understand it better than *Humbert*. Whence comes this partiality?

*BUT*, say's he, *Nicetas* asserts *Transubstantiation*, as fully as *Humbert* could do. Which we must examine. Those, say's *Nicetas*, who walk in the *Light*, eat the Bread of Grace, which is the Body of Christ; and drink his immaculate Blood. In the Bread, say's he, moreover, that is to say, in our Saviour's Body there are three living things, which give life to those that eat worthily thereof, to wit, the Spirit, the Water and Blood, according to that saying, there are three that bear witness, and these three are in one. He proves the Water and Blood are in our Saviour's Body, by the Water and Blood which gushed thence in his Crucifixion, and as to the Spirit, observe here what he say's; The Holy and living Spirit remains in his invivifying Flesh; and we eat this Flesh in the Bread, which is changed by his Holy Spirit, and made the Body of Jesus Christ. We live in him by eating his living and deified Flesh. Could *Nicetas*, add Mr. *Arnaud*, more plainly shew his Opinion touching the *Eucharist*, and more positively exclude Mr. *Claude's* vain Conjectures? Lib. 2. cap. 6. pag. 160.

AND this is that which in the Style of Mr. *Arnaud* is precise and positive. I answer, that by the Bread of Grace, *Nicetas* means the Bread of the New Testament, in opposition to the *Azyme* of the Law, and that his Sence is, that this Bread is the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ, which the *Azyme* cannot be, which he proves. 1. Because the *Azyme* is not Bread till it receives the perfection of Leaven. 2. Because the *Azyme* is a dead thing having no invivifying virtue in it; whereas the leavened Bread has Leaven, which is to it as it were Life and Soul; whence he concludes 'tis proper to become the Mystery of the Body of Christ, seeing there is in this Body three living things, the Spirit, the Water, and Blood, the Water and Blood, because they run down from his pierced side, and the Spirit; because his Flesh was ever joyned to his Divinity. Whence he infers, 'tis in the Bread; and not in the *Azyme* we eat this Flesh, and that the Bread being changed by the Holy Spirit, and made Christ's Body, we live in him, by eating his living and deified Flesh. And this is *Nicetas* his reasoning, which I confess is a little odd; but howsoever, 'tis as I relate it, as plainly appears to him that reads his Writings, his drift being only to shew, that the *Azyme* having nothing in it representing the Life, which is in Jesus Christ, it



it cannot therefore be used for the Mystery of his Body. He himself explains his own meaning in these Terms, *Saint Peter*, say's he, *tells us that we are Partakers of a Divine Nature, and not of the Azyme of the Murderers of God.* Now what man indued with Reason will call the dead Azyme, or the unleavened Bread of the Jews, a Divine Nature? and yet you offer it to God in Sacrifice, and eat it as a Figure of the living Flesh of Jesus Christ. How have you Communion with Jesus Christ, who is the living God? eating dead and unleavened Bread, which appertains to the shadow of the Law, and not the New Testament. If we compare what he say's touching the Azyme, to what he say's afterwards concerning the Leavened Bread, we shall find his aim is only to shew, that one is not proper to represent the living Body of Jesus Christ, and to become the Figure and Representation of it, th'other on the contrary to be most proper. 1. Because 'tis Bread, which th'other is not. 2. Because 'tis in some sort living, whereas th'other is dead. 3. Because it respects Grace, and the New Testament, whereas the other respects the Jews, and Shadow of the Law, there is not one word in all this that favours Transubstantiation. It appears on the contrary, that he takes for one and the same thing, to be a Partaker of the Divine Nature, have Communion with Christ in the Eucharist, and to eat the Bread as a Figure of the living Flesh of Jesus Christ.

Lib. 2. cap. 7.  
pag. 162. &  
163.

Ibid. pag. 162.

BUT we have had enough of this Illusion, let us then pass on to the nineteenth, which consists in alledging the Testimony of *Lanfranc*, whereby to prove to us the *Greeks* believe Transubstantiation. What can, (say's he,) *Mr. Claude* say to this Witness, who so clearly affirms the *Greeks* were of the same Belief as the Church of Rome in the Mystery of the Eucharist? I may truly say, that *Lanfranc* looking upon *Berengarius* his Affair as a cause wherein his own credit was concerned; and resolving therefore to vanquish at any rate, he was interessed to suppose, that all the World was on his side, and that therefore his prejudice invalidates his Testimony. I may also affirm *Mr. Arnaud's* word signifies nothing without Proof, altho it may be as well taken as *Lanfranc's*. I can shew that *Lanfranc* does not scruple to offer us a Fabulous History (touching what passed in *Cyrrillus* of *Alexandria's* time, and *Pope Celestin's*) and to make thereof a good Proof. Whether through Ignorance, or want of Sincerity, I know not, but sure I am we have little reason to trust that man's Testimony, who has so grossly deceived us. He was, say's *Mr. Arnaud*, an Italian by Nation, where there was a great many *Greeks*. Italy certainly would be a very happy Country, if it produced none but faithful Witnesses. Had *Lanfranc* in effect taken care to inform himself by the *Greeks* which were there, what was their Belief touching the Substantial Conversion, he would have told us so himself, and not left it to *Mr. Arnaud's* guesses. It appears, adds he, by his way of writing, that he was a Person worthy of Credit. It appears by his Writings, that he was a passionate man, and extremely carried away with vainglory, which are not the best marks of Sincerity. But after all this, I can tell *Mr. Arnaud* he is deceived in *Lanfranc's* own Testimony. For *Lanfranc* only say's, that all Christians do glory in receiving in the Sacrament the true Flesh and Blood of Christ, which he took of the Virgin. That this is the Faith of the *Greeks*, *Armenians*, and all the rest of the Christian World. Which is grounded only on this expression of the *Greeks*, which bears that the Bread is our Saviour's real Body; and that it must not be said, he has two Bodies, but one alone. Now we have already shewed what they mean by this expression, namely, that the Bread becomes our Saviour's Body by way of Addition, as the Food we eat becomes our Body, which is very different from Transubstantiation.

BUT

BUT, say's Mr. *Arnaud*, the Silence of *Berengarius* and his Followers seems to me also very considerable. I answer, this is another of his wilful mistakes. For first how can he assure us that *Berengarius* and those of his Opinion, never asserted the *Greeks* did not believe the Conversion of Substances? We have scarcely any of their Writings, we have no more of their Arguments and Answers, than what their Adversaries have been pleased to give us. It is true that *Lanfranc* say's, when they were offered several Passages out of the Holy Scriptures, and Saint *Austin's* Works touching the State of the Church, they answered the Church had erred, and all its Members perished, except themselves. But it does not hence follow, that they acknowledged the *Greeks* believed Transubstantiation. They might say the Church had erred, and was perished from the Face of the Earth, meaning the Western Church. They might say the same of the Eastern Church upon the account of other Errours besides Transubstantiation. And then again, who can assure us that *Lanfranc* gives a faithful account of what they said touching this Subject?

IN the second place I will grant that *Berengarius*, and his Followers never mentioned the *Greeks* in their Disputes. Can Mr. *Arnaud* find it strange, that People who were every where persecuted, and afflicted, and had enough to do to preserve themselves, should be ignorant of the Doctrine of the *Greeks*? *Berengarius*, say's he, was thrice at Rome, and had opportunity to inform himself, and we need not doubt but 'twas one of his principal cares. Why not doubt of it? Because Mr. *Arnaud* say's so? Those that are not bound to believe him on his own bare word, will still doubt of it: For he is not infallible, and I may self am one of those that doubt of it, till he proves it. *The Interest of his Cause*, adds he, speaking of me, is so prevalent in him, that he may learn from the Experience of his own Sentiments, what were those of his followers. I confess the Interest of my Cause is a thousand times more dear to me than my life, and Mr. *Arnaud* does me right here; But yet 'tis certain, that had I not the Book of the Perpetuity to answer, I should not much trouble my self about the Opinion of the *Greeks*; for the discovery of Truth, which ought to be the aim of us all, does not depend on what the *Greeks* do, or do not believe, and I should esteem my self in a very miserable condition, had my Faith and Conscience no better Grounds than such a pitiful Principle.

*BERENGARIUS* had the Word of God, which was enough, they need no other Weapons to defend themselves that have this. But supposing his curiosity had moved him to inquire after the Sentiments of the *Greeks*, I know not whether he was in a capacity to satisfy himself. For as far as I understand, he was a Person that gave all he had to the Poor. I no where find he was one of those that had great mens purses at command. And living as he did in the Eleventh Century, wherein there were no other Books than what were Manuscripts (the Art of Printing not being then found out) neither I suppose so free a Commerce betwixt *Constantinople* and *Angers*, as at present; and having moreover neither Consuls nor Emiffaries his Friends to help him in that Country, he may be well excused if he did not exactly know their Doctrine.

BUT in fine, supposing, *Berengarius* and his Followers, were not ignorant of the true Opinion of the Greek Church, where lies the necessity, that they ought to make this an Argument whereby to defend themselves, seeing

'twas never yet pretended that the Opinion of the *Greeks* was the same with that of *Berengarius*.

## C H A P. III.

*Mr. Arnaud's Twenty first Illusion, is, his charging me with maintaining the Greeks never knew the Latins believed Transubstantiation. His Twenty second, consists in offering the Formulary of the Re-union proposed to the Greeks by the Latins: Twenty third, in that he produces the Passages of Latiniz'd Greeks. Twenty fourth, in alledging supposed Authors, or at least doubtful and justly suspected ones. The Twenty fifth, is his producing the Testimonies of several false Greeks link't to the Interests of the Latine Church.*

**H**AD *Mr. Arnaud* left out of his Dispute, touching the *Greeks*, the Illusions I already observed (as it was very reasonable he should) he would have suppressed several whole Chapters, and abridged others, and by this means, we should not have had such just cause to complain of his prolixity. And we should have had yet less, had he been pleased to retrench all that he has written to prove, the *Greeks* could not be ignorant of the Doctrine of the *Latins*, in reference to Transubstantiation. This is the most reasonable thing in the World, for his charging me with attributing to them this ignorance, and the whole Sequel of his Histories, Arguments, and Reflections, whereby to shew the absurdity of this Supposition, all this I say is but a meer Illusion. I never pretended the *Greeks* knew not what the *Latins* held on this Article; and he that shall read with a little more Equity than *Mr. Arnaud* has done, what I wrote in my Answer to the *Perpetuity*, will find, that I have been so far from asserting this Proposition, that I have on the contrary, in several places, supposed they knew it. The Author of the *Perpetuity* having told me the *Greeks* and *Latins* lived together in several places, and yet 'twas never known, there was any Dispute raised amongst them on this Point; I answered, that the *Greeks* content themselves with their own Belief, without making it a matter of contest with Strangers. Now this Answer supposes, that they are not ignorant of what the *Latins* hold. I likewise mentioned upon this account a Passage of *Phabadius*, who tells us, that an humble Conscience contents it self with keeping its own Opinion, and supposes 'tis better to preserve its own Faith, than to trouble it self with examining the Belief of Strangers, which also supposes they knew the Opinion of the Roman Church, but did not trouble themselves about it. This Author alledging afterwards the Re-union of the two Churches made in the Council of *Florence*, I expressly acknowledged, that the *Greeks* seem, to have tacitly suffered the Transubstantiation of the *Latins*, which does still moreover suppose, they were not ignorant of it, for men are not ignorant of what they tolerate. The same Author producing the Answer of the *Greeks* of *Venice*, to the Cardinal de *Gnise's* Questions; I said, that 'twas an Answer contrived on purpose  
not



not to provoke Strangers; ever supposing, as 'tis evident, that they well knew the Doctrine of the *Latins*.

WHAT could then induce Mr. *Arnaud* to charge me with a thing I never so much as imagined, and the contrary of which appears throughout all the Sequel of my Discourse? The Author of the *Perpetuity*, told us, *that* Perpetuity of the Faith. 3. part. cap. 8. *Breerwood*, who wrote a Book touching the diversity of Religions; and exactly denotes all things in which he pretends they differ from the Church of Rome, yet dared not affirm, the Greek Church differed from the *Latine* in the Point of Transubstantiation. That he neither does pretend it of the *Assyrians*, or *Melchites*, *Nestorians*, *Jacobites*, *Eutychites*, *Copticks*, *Egyptians*, nor *Abyssins*, but only *Armenians*. These are his Words, and this my Answer, Answer to 1. Treat. 3. part. cap. 8. As to other Churches, the Author of the *Perpetuity* alledges only the Silence of *Breerwood*, in a Treatise he wrote of Religions, wherein he does not observe, that either the *Greeks*, *Assyrians*, *Melchites*, *Nestorians*, *Jacobites*, *Eutychites*, *Copticks*, *Egyptians*, nor *Abyssins*, do differ from the Doctrine of the Church of Rome, in the Point of Transubstantiation. But certainly our Author is very bare of Proofs, that he must have recourse to the Silence of a man that transiently observes the most noted Differences of Religions, contenting himself with saying, what Points such a People hold, or positively reject, without proceeding to things which they do not believe by way of Negation, as not having heard of them.

THESE last Words, as not having heard of them, have it seems given occasion to all this coyl. But first, Mr. *Arnaud* may consider, if he pleases, that my Answer refers to other Communion, which are called Schismaticks, and that the *Greeks* are mentioned only accidentally and occasionally. Which appears from my own Expressions, for having seperately handled what concerns the *Greeks*, passing to another Subject, I immediately add; As to what concerns People of other Communion, the Author alledges to us only, &c. Whence it is evident, that my intention respects only those other Communion, that I name the *Greeks* only, because they are comprehended amongst the rest in the Author of the *Perpetuitie's* Objection; but yet my Answer primarily respects only the other People. If it be said, that the Objection including the *Greeks* amongst the rest, my Answer must include them also; that in effect it is general, and that otherwise I should have left the Objection relating to the *Greeks*, without an Answer. I reply to this, that my Answer cannot be extended beyond the other Schismatical Communion, to the prejudice of my own expressions, which restrain and determinate it. A man would think People might be so just, as not to charge Persons with those things which are contrary to their express Declarations. Mr. *Arnaud* might accuse me for leaving the Objection drawn from the Silence of *Breerwood*, in relation to the *Greeks* without an Answer. He might have brought it again into the Dispute, if he would, but he could not apply my Words to the *Greeks*, seeing I mentioned them in reference to the other Communion, in opposition to the *Greeks*, of whom I came from treating. What I said before, and what I said even there touching the other Communion, sufficiently shewed what might be answered in this respect to the Objection taken out of *Breerwood*, it not being necessary to make thereof a particular Article, nor to comprehend them amongst the rest. I confess the fence of my Answer in general may be extended as far as the *Greeks*, in observing the differences of them with other People, but to apply them to even the very least of my Terms, and make the World believe that 'twas of them I spake, is that which Justice and Equity cannot suffer, having positively said, as I have done, that I spake of other Communion.

L I 2

B U T

BUT supposing my Answer was to be understood of the *Greeks* themselves; could not Mr. *Arnaud* understand, that I spake of People in general, and not of particular Persons, and meant that the Doctrine of Transubstantiation has made no noise amongst the People; that their Pastors, never proposed it to 'em in order to its being received by them, nor declaimed against it, to make them reject it; and in a word, that they never made of it an Article of Faith, nor Controversie. My Sence appears by the bare reading of my Answer. *Breerwood*, said I, *has only transiently observed the common differences of Religions, contenting himself with telling us what People imbrace, or what they positively reject, without proceeding to the things they do not believe by way of Negation, as not having heard speak of them.* It is clear I distinguish three sorts of Points, some which these People profess positively to believe, others which they profess likewise positively to reject, and the third which they do not believe, or expressly reject. 'Tis in this third Rank, I put Transubstantiation in respect of them. They never heard of it, as a Point they ought to believe, or an Errour they ought positively to reject. They meet not with it either amongst the Articles their Religion teaches, nor amongst those which it opposes, and expressly condemns. And this is what I call in respect of this People, the not believing a thing by way of Negation, as not having heard speak of it. I ought not for this to be charged with an absolute denial, that the *Greeks* never heard the *Latins* believed Transubstantiation, for there is a great deal of difference betwixt these two things. I speak of People in general, and not of particular Persons, and I speak moreover of Points which are not found either amongst the Articles, which are to be believed, nor amongst those that are actually to be rejected; and not of those concerning which we may be historically informed that other People hold them.

LET any man judge then of Mr. *Arnaud's* Character, and with what kind of Person I am concerned. Besides what I come from observing, we shall immediately see how he abuses what I said, touching the Halcyon days of the Church. He catches at the least expressions, and if he can turn any of 'em into a counter sence, he makes thereof a matter of Triumph. This proceeding seems wholly unworthy a Person of his Reputation. Had he designed to enrich himself with the Spoils of *Allatius* and *Raynaldus*, and to transcribe as he has done their Histories, could not he find a juster occasion than this to introduce them into his Volum? Or if he could find no better, must the love he has to Stories, and the pleasure he takes in imposing on us, prevail over his Conscience, which forbids him to charge me with a false meaning, with a Sence (as is apparent) I never had, and which has no relation to the Sequel of my Discourse.

AND yet 'tis on no better Grounds than these, that he makes me draw Systems and build Machines; that he makes general Divisions of the World, assembles Councils, sends out Ambassadors, transports Armies, fills *Jerusalem* with Pilgrims, preaches Croisado's, and conquers the Holy Land, *Constantinople* and the *Grecian Empire*; that he fills the East with Bishops, Abbots, Religious, and Latin Inquisitors; that he introduces Princes, Kings, Emperours, and Popes, and sets on foot Negotiations, makes Treaties of Peace, and Re-union between the two Churches; and all this to prove the *Greeks* were not ignorant the *Latins* held Transubstantiation, which is to say, to prove a thing I never denied. Who could think that all this costly and stare-ly

ly Pageantry should be carried about to so little purpose ; and all these great Figures be put upon their motion without any necessity , to convince us of a thing we never denied ? Yet is it true that 'twas only a false equivocation that has occasioned all this preparation and bustle , an equivocation, which had he but been pleased to consult me about for a fuller meaning of it (supposing there were need of it) I could have saved him all this trouble of Translating *Allatius* and *Raynaldus*, and several other Passages from the Greek of *Pachimerus* and *Anne Comnenus*.

I would have told him I never intended to deny , but 'tis possible the Greeks knew what was the Opinion of the *Latins* concerning the Substantial Conversion. But withal , that since the Eleventh Century to this present, this Nation has been so prodigiously ignorant and careless in matters of Religion , and so perplexed with their Temporal Affairs , that 'twould be no Paradox to affirm the greatest part amongst them knew little of what the *Latins* believe in this particular , seeing 'tis certain they scarcely know what they believe themselves. That which I asserted in the beginning of this Controversie touching their ignorance , confirms what I say. But observe here moreover what *Thomas à Fesù* has written. *The Greeks*, say's he, *since their Separation from the Catholick Church*, are *fallen into a most desperate ignorance*, which will more plainly appear, if we cast our eyes on the *Ages which preceded the Separation*, wherein Greece was the Mother of all Arts and Sciences. He afterwards relates a Passage taken out of *Bozins* , in these Words. *Since the Sixteenth Century*, when the Greek Church began to separate from us, there has scarcely any Person been found amongst them, excelling in any Science : 'Tis certain Gregory relates, that in the Emperour Andronicus his time (which is about 250 years since) there was not a Person in all Greece that was able to dispute with our People about Religion ; and now there is not one that can be truly said to be indifferently learned. If any amongst them desire to learn any thing , they must leave Constantinople , and come to the Colledge at Rome , which Gregory the Thirteenth built for the Greeks. All the Bishops amongst them are taken out of the Order of Monks , who have a Law amongst them to this effect , that all those that study Philosophy shall be excommunicated , as testifies Belon in the first Book of his Observations. Now there is nothing more 'useful to men for the finding of the Truth than solid Philosophy. And therefore, the Devil to keep the Greeks in this ignorance, has so ordered it, that the Bishops are still elected from amongst the Monks, and that moreover the Monks should lay this necessity upon themselves of being ignorant.

*Thomas à Fesù  
de proc. Salv.  
omn. gent. lib.  
6. cap. 3.*

'TIS likely Persons in these Circumstances do not trouble themselves with Inquiries into the Opinions of the *Latins* touching the Mystery of the *Eucharist* ; and in effect amongst all those that have written since the Eleventh Century to this present, (excepting the Latinizing Greeks) there will be found very few that mention the Belief of the Roman Church, touching the Conversion of Substances , which shews that they are not well instructed in it.

YET do not I believe this ignorance has been so Universal, but that there have been some from time to time, who sufficiently understood the Opinion of the *Latins*, and especially those that have had most Commerce with them , as for instance, such as negotiated the Re-unions , those that conferred with the Emisaries , and were Assessors at the Council of *Florence* , and such as were forced to live under the Jurisdiction of *Latine Bishops*. Mr. *Arnaud* needed



needed not trouble himself with proving this, for 'tis a thing we grant him.

SO that here are already several of Mr. *Arnaud's* Illusions, and yet we are not at the end of all those he has imposed on us, touching this single Article of the *Greeks*.

Lib. 3. cap. 3.  
pag 275.

Ibid. pag 277.

WE may moreover reckon into this number the perpetual Quotation of this Form of a Re-union, which was so often offered to the *Greeks*, and which the *Greeks* have sometimes received when they were at accord with the *Latine Church*. He tells us, that the *Emperour Michael Paleologus* his *Deputies* being arrived at the Council of Lyons, presented the *Emperours Letters* to the *Pope*, containing in exprest Terms the Confession of Faith, which was sent them by *Clement the Fourth*, and *Gregory the Tenth*, wherein Transubstantiation is expressly inserted in these Terms. *Sacramentum Eucharistiae ex Azymo conficit Romana Ecclesia, tenens & docens quod in ipso Sacramento, Panis verè transubstantiatur in Corpus, & Vinum in Sanguinem Domini Jesu Christi.* He adds, that this Profession of Faith was sworn to on the *Emperours* part by *George Acropolitus*, and that the *Legate* of the Council of the *Greeks* presented likewise a Letter to the *Pope*, as from the *Metropolitain of Ephesus*, and thirty *Greek Bishops*, and that he swore in their name, after the same manner the *Ambassador* had done to imbrace intirely the forementioned Confession of Faith, wherein Transubstantiation was expressed. He tells us moreover, that in the Confession of Faith, which *John Veccus* inserted in his Letters as well in his own Name, as in the Name of the *Greek Bishops*, that Transubstantiation was expressly contained in it, altho occasionally upon account of the *Azymes*; *credentes & nos ipsum Azymum panem in ipso Sacro Officio Eucharistiae verè transubstantiari in Corpus Domini nostri Jesu Christi, & Vinum in Sanguinem ejus per Sanctissimi Spiritus Virtutem & Operationem.* That they likewise do believe the unleavened Bread is transubstantiated into the Body of *Christ*. He afterwards observes, this Confession of the *Greek Bishops* was not expressed in the same Terms, as that which was sent thence by *Clement the Fourth*, and *Gregory the Tenth*; but that this difference has no after effect in respect of the Article of the *Azymes*, and that of Transubstantiation, but that 'tis expressed more plainly than in the Confession of Faith compiled by *Clement*.

Allat. de Corp.  
Concil. lib. 2.  
cap. 17.

SO that if we will believe Mr. *Arnaud*, we have here Transubstantiation formally received and acknowledged by the *Greek Church*. But all this is but a meer Delusion. This Confession of Faith in the Latin of *Raynoldus*, from whom Mr. *Arnaud* has borrowed whatsoever he has alledged concerning it, has indeed these Words, *Panis verè Transubstantiatur in Corpus, & Vinum in Sanguinem*, but as I already observed, in the *Greek* which *Allatius* cites touching the Re-union of the *Emperour John Paleologus*, there are these Words, *ὁ ἄρτος ἀληθῶς μεταβάλλεται εἰς Σῶμα, καὶ ὁ οἶνος εἰς αἷμα τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ*, The Bread is really changed into the Body, and the Wine into the Blood of our Lord *Jesus Christ*. Changed, is not transubstantiated. I have already shown there is a great deal of difference between these two Terms. The *Greeks* hold that the Bread is changed into the Body, which is not the Point in question; but whether they believe 'tis transubstantiated. Mr. *Arnaud* was not ignorant of the difference between the *Latine* and *Greek* Copy of this Confession of Faith, for he has taken notice of it himself elsewhere upon the Subject of the Re-union of the *Emperour John Paleologus*, and has no better defence for it, than saying, that the *μεταβάλλεται* of the *Greeks*, and the *Transubstantiatur* of the *Latins* are Synonymous Terms. Why did he not mention this difference in this place, and wherefore has he grounded

grounded his Proof on the Latin Expressions? *The Doctrine of Transubstantiation*, say's he, *is expressly inserted in this Confession of Faith. I will shew Mr. Claude Transubstantiation solemnly approved by the Greek Church in the same manner as men approve things they ever believed, and of which they have not the least doubt.* And a little after. *And thus I obliged my self to shew him the Doctrine of Transubstantiation signed and sworn to by the Greeks.* And this indeed he does shew us, if we only consider the Latin Text; but if we consult the Greek, we shall find quite another thing, than what he pretends. We shall find indeed the *Latins* do believe Transubstantiation, and endeavour to insinuate it amongst the *Greeks*; but we shall likewise find that the *Greeks* depart not from their general expressions. For to tell us that *μεταβάλλειν*, and *transubstantiatur* are Synonymous Terms, is what I deny, and have refuted already, and shall again refute in the following Discourse. This whole Proof which Mr. *Arnaud* has been so earnest upon, reduces it self to a thing which we do not deny him, which is, that the *Greeks* hold the Bread is really changed into the Body, and the Wine into the Blood. This Confession of Faith informs us of no new thing, but that which I already acknowledged is to be found amongst the Greek Authours. Why then must this be made a matter of Triumph? It remains still to inquire whether they understand it of a change of Substance, which is our only Question. Moreover Mr. *Arnaud* must not think to draw advantage from *Fohn Vecessus* the Patriarch of *Constantinople's* Letter in that the Confession of Faith contained therein is not expressed in the same Terms, as that sent by *Clement* and *Gregory*, which was signed and sworn to by the Emperours Ambassadors, and by the *Greeks* Legat in the Council at *Lyons*, for it appears by reading this Letter, and comparing it with the Formulary of *Clement* and *Gregory*, that in respect of the Articles of Penance, Purgatory, and the Sacraments, 'tis the same thing, and the same expressions, excepting some slight alterations which were necessarily made, either to make the Greek Church speak in its own name, or to reserve as they do the Custom of Confirmation by the Priests, or else moreover to apply to their leavened Bread, what is not said in the other, but only of the *Azyme*. But as to essential Terms, and those that respect the Doctrinal Part, they are absolutely the same, and we must make the same Judgment of them.

WE may likewise justly rank amongst the number of Mr. *Arnaud's* Illusions the Testimonies of several latinizing *Greeks*, who left their Religion to embrace the Roman. He cites Passages out of *Emanuel Galeas*, concerning whom he say's himself, *That he was of the Order of Fryar Preachers, and wrote four Books against the Error of the Greeks touching the Procession of the Holy Ghost.* He quotes Cardinal *Bessarion*, and one *Gregory*, who both of 'em wrote against *Marc* of *Ephesus* in favour of the *Latins* to defend what passed in the Council of *Florence*. He alledges several Passages out of *Fohn Plusiadennus*, *Gennadius*, *Scholarius*, and a certain Religious man named *Hilarion*, all zealous Defenders of the same Council, all of 'em openly engaged in the Defence and Propagation of the Roman Doctrines. Every man sees that such kind of Persons as these are no more fit to decide our Question, than *Thomas Aquinas* would be, or the *Trent* Fathers, and that 'tis not fair to bring in such Persons for Witnesses in this Controversie.

MR. *Arnaud* will say without doubt he has alledged them only, because they reproached not the *Greeks* with their not believing Transubstantiation. But if he proposed to himself no other advantage, it was not necessary for this

this to cite their Passages at length, as he has done, nor mark in great Characters the places wherein they assert the change of Substance, to dazle the Reader's Eyes. It were sufficient to rank these Authors in general amongst the *Latins*, and reduce the advantage he would draw from their Silence to this negative Argument, which we will examine in the sequel of this Discourse, which consists in that the *Latins* never accused the *Greeks* for their not believing the substantial Conversion. But howsoever it were a just thing to lay aside all these Passages, as absolutely fruitless and impertinent, and if there be any reflexion to be made on their Silence, it shall be taken notice of in its proper place.

NEITHER is it less just to retrench from this Dispute all doubtful Authors, which is to say, such concerning whom we have no assurance, whether the Works attributed to them are theirs, nor indeed whether there were ever any such Authors in the World. I put immediately in this Rank *Samonas* the pretended Bishop of *Gaza*. Mr. *Arnaud* bestirs himself to prove contrary to Mr. *Aubertin's* Conjecture, that in the Thirteenth Century, which is to say, in the time wherein this Archbishop of *Gaza* is reckoned to have lived, there were Greek Bishops in *Palestine*. But he does not undertake to shew that *Samonas* was of this number, nor that any Person ever mentioned him. There are, say's he, five hundred Treatises of the Fathers, which must be rejected, if it were sufficient to respect them as Apochryphal, that they were not cited by others. His five hundred Treatises I grant; but there are not five hundred Fathers of whom no body ever made mention, and which are not named by others. When a name of an Author is unknown to Authors that lived in the same Age, and those that follow, this is certainly a sufficient reason to make his Book suspected. Mr. *Arnaud* then needed not find it strange, if we place his *Samonas* in this order, till such time as he has more clearly proved his Authority. Supposing Mr. *Aubertin* was mistaken in his Conjecture, and that there were indeed Greek Bishops in *Palestine*, when the *Saracens* possessed it, this does not conclude that *Samonas* was of this number, nor that his Dispute against *Achmet* was real. Mr. *Arnaud's* Custom is, that when he finds any trivial matter, altho of never so little importance to our Controversie, to stick at it, and use his utmost skill thereon, to the end, that under the favour of these vain Triumphs, he may conceal his weakness in Matters of greater moment. Which is what he has done in this occasion; for seeing he could not give any colour to the Testimony of this *Samonas*, he therefore falls upon Criticising; and heats himself to shew there were in the Thirteenth Century Greek Bishops in *Palestine*, under the Empire of the *Saracens*, and by this pretence would obtrude on us this Passage of *Samonas*.

WE may likewise reckon amongst this Rank of suspected Authors, One *Agapins*, whom Mr. *Arnaud* say's was a Monk of Mount *Athos*, from whom Mr. *Arnaud* has taken some Passages. I believe his Collections are true, and that he has faithfully translated them. But what assurance have we this was not a counterfeit Author? Mr. *Arnaud* tells us, that he lately met with this Book written in *Vulgar Greek*. This accidental meeting does already disgust me, as if 'twere meer chance that brought him acquainted with this Author. And yet we know well enough how careful those of the Roman Church are, to gather up these kind of pieces that are favourable to them; and which may serve them as well against the *Greeks* as Protestants, especially such as this, which expressly denotes Christ's Substance under the Accidents and Appearances



ances of Bread and Wine. They could find nothing so emphatical in any other Author; how then comes it to pass they neglected this *Agapius*, and that in such a manner, that, Mr. *Arnaud* who has his Correspondents every where, in *Italy, Greece, Suedland, Moscovia, and Syria*, yet should light of this Book only by Chance? He tells us this Book, *was perhaps wrote during the time wherein Cyrillus was Patriarch, for Cyrillus dyed but in the Year 1638, and this Religious's Book was Printed at Venice till 1641.* If this be all that can be said in this Matter, every one will judge this is not sufficient to give Credit to a Book: The Printing Presses at *Venice* are no more free from Fraud and Fiction, than those of other Cities.

*Tam ficti pravique tenax quam nuncia veri.*

*CYRILLUS* his Confession, offended the Latins sufficiently enough to Oblige them to Oppose against him a Testimony so Express and Authentick as this is. Being an Author, a Religious of Mount *Athos*, of this Mount which according to Mr. *Arnaud* is the Seminary of Religious for the whole East, and whose Faith he says, is that of all the Greek Churches, how then has it hapned they have so much slighted him, as not to produce him against *Cyrillus*: *Caryophyllus* wrote a Treatise on purpose to Refute this Patriarchs Confession; but he makes no mention therein of *Agapius*. *Leo Allatius* has outrageously used the same Patriarch in his Book, *de Perpetua Consensione*, and has not fail'd to describe at length the Councils of *Cyrillus de Berrhea*, and *Parthenius*; but he mentions not a word of *Agapius*. The aforesaid *Allatius* wrote a Book against Dr. *Creygton*, wherein he indeavours to prove the Greeks believe Transubstantiation. He has made a Collection of whatsoever favours his Cause out of all Authors, whether Prints or Manuscripts. Mr. *Arnaud* knows it very well, seeing 'tis from thence he has taken his most specious Arguments; but he tells us not a Word of *Agapius*, which makes me justly Suspect, that 'tis the Work of some Imposture: But be it as it will, 'tis silly to Triumph with it, till 'tis proved Authentick.

IN fine, to clear the Dispute of all Impertinencies, and Illusions with which Mr. *Arnaud* has pestered it, we must retrench the Testimonies of the false Greeks, that is to say of those, who having bin brought up in Latin Seminaries, (and being in their Hearts Romanists) yet Live in the Communion of the Greek Schismatical Church, and even sometimes Possess the highest Dignities. *Gerganus* Bishop of *Arta* in the Epistle before his Catechism complains very much against these sort of People. He says they are secret Enemies, outwardly seem to be Greeks, but are Latins in their Hearts, and *Caryophyllus* that relates this Complaint of *Gerganus*, agrees in this Particular. We have already seen by Report of the Jesuits themselves, that one of the chiefest Employes of the Missionaries in the East, is to gain privately the Bishops and Priests, to make use of them upon Occasion, or insensibly to insinuate the Romish Faith into the Minds of the Greek Youth, under Pretence of teaching them Languages and Philosophy, that by this means they may fill by degrees the Ecclesiastical Charges with their Creatures. We have already seen even by the Testimony of *Allatius* and *Thomas a Jesu*, that this is the Advantage received from the Seminary at *Rome*, wherein Greek Children are brought up in the Opinions and Maxims of the Roman Church, and from whence they are sent into their own Countries, to receive Orders from Schismatical Bishops, to the end they may be promoted to Bishopricks by the Schismatical Patriarchs, and carry on the Latin Interest under this false Pretence.

tence. I do not pretend to decide here the Question whether this way of Proceeding be justifiable or not, this being not my Business: Let every Man judg thereof as he pleases. But I Affirm, 'tis not possible for People to be more disingenuously dealt with, than we are by Mr. *Arnaud*, in making use of the Testimony of these Persons, whereby to decide the Question between us. If this be his way of *Confounding Ministers*, and *Triumphing at their Defeat*, his Victories indeed will be easy, but his Triumph neither Honourable nor Just: Is it not a disingenuous Artifice thus to make use (as he hath done) of the Mystery of the Missions and Seminaries to blind the World, imagining his indirect Dealing will scape being taken Notice of.

AND thus does Mr. *Arnaud* gloriously retayl out to us the Testimony of *Paysius Ligaridius* together with the Letters of Mr. *de Pomponne* his Nephew. He first produces some Collections out of him, Translated into our Language, and in fine has Translated his Treatise into Latin, and inserted it in his 12th. Book. Would we know who this *Paysius Ligaridius* is, observe what Mr. *Pomponne* has writ of him in his Letter. *He is a Greek, say's he, by Nation, and a Religious of the Order of St. Basil: He was sometime a Student at Rome and Padoua, and being returned from thence to Constantinople, was made Archbishop of Gaza in Palestine.* Mr. *Pomponne* seems to make this Acknowledgment with some kind of Constraint. *I the rather tell you, say's he, whatsoever I know of this Archbishop, because I do not doubt, but some Calvinists here, have given notice of this Treatise to Mr. Claude, and informed him he ought to be Suspected, seeing he was Educated at Rome, and went out Doctor at Padoua, so that he may think his Testimony ought to be rejected, being brought up in our Religion.* Should we not have known then of Mr. *Pomponne*, what kind of Man this Archbishop was, were it not for that he feared some Calvinists at *Stockholm* would give an Account of him to *Claude* the Minister? Alas, we are not beholding to him for his Account, for we can be informed elsewhere, by a Latiniz'd Greek at *Venice*, who goes under the Name of *Signor Gradenigo*; observe what he lately Wrote concerning him. *Paysius Ligaridius studied at Rome, and when he left that City, was a Zealous Defendor of the Latins, but I heard since he has publicly abjured the Romish Religion, when made Metropolitan of Gaza.*

TO give the World a more particular Character of this Person, and such as are like him, it will not be amiss to relate at large this Abjuration mentioned by *Signor Gradenigo*. Observe here then what Dr. *Bazire* an English Divine, ( whose Testimony I have already Cited ) wrote to me, who was present at *Jerusalem*, when *Paysius* was made Archbishop of *Gaza*. *In the Year 1646, say's he, during the Troubles in England, King Charles the first of Blessed Memory, sent me over from England to France, to his Son then Prince of Wales, my now gracious Sovereign Charles the Second, whom God grant long to Reign. After an abode of two Years in France, I resolved to make a long Voyage, and to visit all Syria, Mesopotamia, and Palestine, which I did in five Years time. Being in the Year 1652 at Jerusalem in the Temple of the Sepulchre, ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ τῶν τοπικῶν ἱεροῦ καὶ ἐκκεῖθεν, to pray and behold the Holy Places, in Imitation of that Alexander mentioned by Eusebius in the sixth Book of his Ecclesiastical History, Paysius Ligaridius, came to me from the Patriarch of Constantinople, ( whose Name likewise was Paysius, ) to present me with a Cake, on which was described the whole History of our Saviour from his Annunciation to his Ascension, and in leaving me, Invited me to be present on the Morrow at his Spiritual Marriage; these were his Expressions, meaning his Installment into the Dignity of Metropolitan of Gaza. The next Day being the fourteenth of September 'twas performed, and I was present*

sent at the Ceremony. The Patriarch sat upon his Throne, which was hung with rich Turkey Carpets, and under him sat the Metropolitans, and a little lower the Bishops, Archimandrites, &c. Whilst the Office was Celebrating, Ligaridius rehearsed a Confession of Faith, a Copy of which he afterwards gave me: Before his Consecration, he twice or thrice, trampled under his Feet a Picture which represented a City situated on seven Hills, with a two headed Eagle, soaring over it: The Latins there present were extremely offended thereat, for they knew well enough this City represented Rome. After the Consecration was ended, I withdrew into a publick House of Entertainment in the City, where the Latins usually resorted, where being at Dinner, I shared my Cake amongst the Company, giving part of it to the Popes Vicar, the Gray Fryers and Priest that dined with us, who kindly accepted it. But when I would have done the like to the Laity there present, they refused it with the greatest Detestation, saying 'twas the Cake of that Schismatick Ligaridius, who even now trampled under his Feet the City and Church of Rome. After Dinner the Popes Vicar, who was a learned and honest Man, began a Discourse with me touching the Invocation of Saints, and especially of the Holy Virgin; and as I was about alledging to him a Passage out of St. Epiphanius, Ligaridius came in and interrupted our Discourse. He began immediately to desire the Company not to be offended at what he had done: his Excuse was pleasant, for he told us he thought of nothing less than the City of Rome in this Action; but by this Ceremony practised in the Greek Church, he meant the trampling under his Feet the Vanities of the World represented by this City, and the renouncing of them; Yet this Excuse was not well taken by the Vicar, who was a wiser Man than to be content therewith. When he was gon, he told me that he was a notorious Hypocrite, and received an Annual Pension from the Pope, which he had paid him for several Years, but he should have it no longer for the future. And this is this Paysius Ligaridius, of whom I shall say no more, but leave the Reader to judg of the Validity of such a Mans Testimony.

ANY Man may likewise judg of the Writings of a certain Moldavian Gentleman, called the Baron of Spartaris, whom Mr. Arnaud Cites together with Mr. Pompone his Nephews Letter. In which amongst other things there are these Expressions: He agrees in general with us in all things, excepting one Particular, namely the Procession of the Holy Ghost. He comes every Holyday to my House to Mass, and excepting the Creed wherein he forgets the Filioque, there is not a better Catholick in the World. Is not this the exact Character of one of those false Greeks already mentioned by us, who are Greeks with the Greeks, and Latins with the Latins? Who knows not that the Greeks, I mean the Reconciled ones, as they are called, differ from the Latins, not only in that they omit the Filioque in the Creed; but likewise in the use of Leavened Bread, in the Communion under both kinds, and in abundance of Ceremonies? That those called Schismatics abhor carved Images, and Invoke not the Latin Saints, nor Believe Purgatory, reject the Primacy of the Roman Bishop, and will not Communicate with the Latins, and so greatly abhor their Sacrifice, that when a Latin Priest says Mass on one of their Altars, they Wash and Purify it several times, as having bin Polluted? Mr. Pompone was deceiv'd when he supposed the nearer his Barons Religion approached to that of the Latins, the more his Uncles Cause was advantaged, when on the contrary by this Means, the Quality of this Witness is discovered, and his Testimony appears plainly Invalid. An Excess of Zeal made Mr. Pompone go too far, but thus it pleased God to order it. to the end our Innocency and Simplicity might not be Surprized with these kind of Delusions. As to what remains, I shall only here Observe the Imprudence of his Witness, who assures us, that



every Year on the first Sunday in Lent, which the Greeks call the Orthodox Sunday, the Patriarch of Constantinople excommunicates in his Patriarchal Temple in the Presence of the Archbishops, and Bishops, and also of the Ambassadors of Christian Kings and Princes, all Hereticks, and especially those, says he, that Oppose Transubstantiation; Mr. Arnaud has caused to be Printed in great Characters these Words, *Maxime vero qui Transubstantiationi adverfantur*. Not Remembling that he himself related the Terms of this Excommunication, wherein there is not a word said touching Transubstantiation, nor those that Oppose it. Were what the Baron Spataris says true, Mr. Arnaud has bin Treacherous to his own Cause in suppressing so important and decisive a Clause, and has bin at a great deal of Pains to no purpose in all this Dispute, seeing he might have produced this Excommunication and stuck to it.

THAT which we have already seen touching *Paysius Ligaridius*, and the Moldavian Gentleman, may serve as a Rule whereby to judge of the Testimony of some Greek Priests, under the Patriarchate of *Antioch*. The Care the Emissaries take to make Profelytes in this Country, will make us cease wondering that there should be six Greek Priests found ready to acknowledg and sign whatsoever was offered them. Moreover they live near the *Maronites*, who have bin (as it is well known) long since Reunited to the Church of *Rome*, and governed by Persons who favour the Propagating of the *Latins* Doctrines. *Cyrillus* when Patriarch of *Alexandria*, seems to have foretold what has now hapned, in his Letter to *Wytemboyard*; The Principal, says he, of the *Maronites* professes the *Roman Religion*, and the Patriarchate of *Antioch* lying near them, I am afraid it will be Corrupted, altho they are advertised of this Danger by that Patriarch, and also by my self. As to the Synod held at *Cyprus* in the Year 1688: 'tis well known this Island has bin under the Direction of the Roman Prelate and Latin Bishops, since the thirteenth Century to the Year 1571, in which time the Turks took it from the *Venetians*. We need not then wonder if the People thereof follow the Doctrine of the *Latins*, especially considering the Pope has still kept up his Emissaries there from that time. The two Treatises mentioned by Mr. Arnaud, carry with 'em such Marks as will easily discover them: For the first of them begins thus, *some generous French Priests have addressed themselves to us, and requested our Opinion touching the Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist*. The other, that it was Transcribed from the Acts of the Synod, at the Request of the Reverend Father Francis de Brisac a Capucin and one of the Emissaries of the Holy Mission of *Larnece*. All this is only an Effect of the Missions; and Mr. Arnaud would have bin never the less esteemed, had he made no use of these Testimonies, for such kind of Proofs as these will never terminate the Difference betwixt us, seeing there are on the other side solid Reasons, and authentick Testimonies against him.

*Vide lib. 12.  
Mr. Arnaud.*

## CHAP. IV.

*The Testimonies of some Protestants alledged by Mr. Arnaud, touching the Belief of the Greeks, Answered.*

**I**T appears already that Mr. *Arnaud* must have greatly abridged his Dispute touching the *Greeks*, had he designed to clear it from all its Illusions; and had reduced it into a lesser Volume still, had he retrenched all the needless Matters it contains. I place in this Rank the Testimonies of some Protestants which he alleges, who seem to acknowledge, either by a formal Declaration, or by their Silence, that, the *Greeks* do not differ from the *Latins* in the Subject of Transubstantiation. I confess he has not made a Proof thereof, as knowing the Matter would not bear it, yet has wrote an express Chapter about it, and produces them with a great deal of Art and Pomp, hoping by this means to make some Impression on the Mind of his Readers, and prepossess them with this Imagination, that I alone amongst all the Protestants deny the *Greeks* believe Transubstantiation.

THE first he produces is *Crusius* Professor in the University of *Tubinga*, who says, *that the Greeks believe the Bread is changed into the Body of Jesus Christ, and the Wine into his Blood*; but this is not Transubstantiation, there being a vast Difference betwixt this and that. *Crusius* relates the Terms which they use, and this is not Contested, the Question is whether by these Terms, they mean a real Conversion of Substances: Which is what we deny.

HE offers us likewise something out of *Grotius* against *Rivet*, and sets again before us the Testimony of *Forbesius* Bishop of *Edinburg*. But we all know these two Persons ( altho otherwise learned enough, especially *Grotius* ) suffered themselves to be carried away by Prejudices and whimsical Projects, in relation to the Differences between the two Churches, which they pretended to Reconcile and Accomodate, and thereupon wrote several things which they did not thoroughly Examine. Moreover *Grotius* in those Passages alledged by Mr. *Arnaud*, speaks not of Transubstantiation in particular, and *Forbesius* only says, *that 'twas received by most of the Greeks, by most*: Here's a Restriction, Mr. *Arnaud* says that *Forbesius* does not prove it. But whether he proves it or not, we do not much matter, for 'tis not by such a man, and his Writings that we are willing to regulate our Sentiments. It lyes upon Mr. *Arnaud* who cites him, to see whether the Testimony of such a man be sufficient. He adds, *he alleges him neither as a Catholick nor Protestant, but as a learned Man well skilled in all the Religions of Europe, and as a great Traveller: that he quotes him as St. Augustin quoted Tichonius to confirm an important Matter of Fact acknowledged by this Donatist, who was more sincere than his Fellows.*

BUT how comes he to forget so soon the Qualification which the Author of the *Perpetuity* gave him, in citing him? *Forbesius*, says he, *one of the most learned amongst the English Protestants*. What account does he think we will make of a Person whom he can neither alledge as a Protestant nor Catholick, and yet

yet lived in the midst of the Protestants, he alledges him, says he, as a learned Man, I grant he may be so. But was this learned Man a Jew, Turk, or Moor, whilst Bishop of *Edinburg*? St. *Augustin* never alledged *Tichonius* as a Person of this kind, that was neither Catholick, nor *Donatist*, but as a real *Donatist*, altho *Tichonius* sincerely acknowledged a Truth which the rest denyed, accordingly as we alledg often the Doctors of the Roman Church, which acknowledg those things others deny, altho we do not thence infer they are not of that Religion they Profess.

Pag. 131.

Præfat. ad  
Crispoph.  
Angl.

*FELAVIUS* adds Mr. Arnaud, derides the Insolence of Hottinger, who pretends to make advantage of *Cyrrillus* his Confession, and shews it does in no wise contain the Faith of the Eastern Churches. *Felavius* does not speak of Hottinger's Insolence, but on the contrary calls him *Virum doctissimum, Clarissimum Hottingerum*. He grants not indeed with Hottinger, that *Cyrrillus* his Confession contains the Doctrine of the Greek Church, and shews his Reasons, but inveighs not against Hottinger thereupon, nor particularly mentions Transubstantiation.

OF all those that Mr. Arnaud alledges, there are only *Sands*, and *Dannhavers* Professor of *Strasbourg*, who attribute this Doctrine to the *Greeks*, and *Sands* adds a term of Restriction, saying, that in the main, they do in a manner agree with the Church of Rome, in the Doctrine of Transubstantiation, &c. But for two Authors, who perhaps wrote this without much Reflection, how many others can we produce, who stick not to deny there's any Conformity in this Article between the *Greeks* and *Latins*? For not to mention here *Kemnitius*, *Boxorinius*, *Hospinian* and *Episcopius*, whom Mr. Arnaud grants to be of this number, we may here name the famous Bishop *Morton*, the Author of a Book intituled, *Catholick Tradition, or a Treatise touching the Belief of the Christians of Asia, Europe, and Affrica*. The Learned *Saddecl* for whom *Henry* the IV. had such great Esteem and Kindness. Mr. *Mestrezat*, Monsieur *Ulric* Minister of *Zurich*, Mr. Hottinger Professor in the same City, Mr. *Robert Chreygton* an English Doctor who published the History of *Syropulus*, and several others which I mention not, because 'tis not necessary to make an exact enumeration of them. It is sufficient that Mr. Arnaud knows I mean the general Opinion of the most Learned Protestants in this particular.

IF some amongst them, as *Chytrens*, *Breerwood*, and *Hornbeck* for Instance, who discourse of the Religion of the *Greeks*, say nothing concerning the Article of Transubstantiation, Mr. Arnaud must not think to draw Advantage from their Silence. The reason of their Silence is, that they set not themselves to the describing any other Points but those that have bin expressly Controverted between the Greek and Latin Church, that is to say, such Points as have bin openly and solemnly Debated on both sides, such as the Article of the Procession of the Holy Ghost, that of the Azymes, that of Purgatory, and some others. All that then can be gathered from this Silence is, that the *Greeks* never openly quarrelled with the *Latins* about Transubstantiation, nor the *Latins* with the *Greeks*, and that both one and the other contented themselves in keeping their own Sentiments and particular manner of Expressions, without condemning one another. But as it does not hence follow, that the *Greeks* received the Doctrine of the *Latins*, so we must not take the Silence of *Chytrens*, *Breerwood*, nor *Hornbeck* for an Acknowledgment, or tacit Confession, that there is no difference in this Point between the two Churches. Which is what I already answered to the Author of the *Perpetuity*, who would have prevail'd



prevail'd by the Silence of *Breerwood*, in relation to the other Schismatical Communions. For I told him, that this Author does only transiently observe the most common different Religions, contenting himself to say what People Imbrace, or what they positively and expressly Reject, without proceeding to mention things which they believe not by way of Negation, as not having heard of them. That is to say, as neither finding them in the Articles propos'd to 'em to Believe, nor in those which they were made expressly to Renounce, as I have already explain'd. Mr. *Arnaud* sets himself against this Answer, and say's, *I Lib. 2. C. 47* shew by this, that provided I say any thing 'tis enough, for I trouble not my self whether it be Rational or not. But if he Believes my Discourse to be Irrational, it lyes upon him to shew the Absurdity of it, without Misrepresenting my Sence, and beating the Air as he does. There is certainly no Discourse more reasonable than that against which an Adversary is forced to betake himself to Illusions and Wranglings about Terms, for this is a sign he cannot attack it fairly with downright Blows.

AS to Mr. *Aubertin*, of whom Mr. *Arnaud* say's, he has temper'd himself, and that altho he be otherwise one of the Confidentest Men in the World, in asserting Untruths, yet it appears he finds himself gravelled in the Subject of the Greeks, and therefore falls to searching Means to escape. I answer, Mr. *Arnaud* himself is one of the boldest Men in the World at accusing Persons, and yet proves his Accusations the worst of any man, as appears in this whole Controversie, so that what he says touching Mr. *Aubertin*'s Falsities, being grounded only on his own Word, signifies nothing, in respect of the Greeks; 'tis true that Mr. *Aubertin* has not thoroughly handled the Question of their Belief, because his Design did not oblige him to do it, for intending only to shew the Innovation which has bin made in the Church of *Rome*, in the Subject of the Eucharist, he has sufficiently done it without needless Enlargings on the Greeks. He says something of them by the way, he explain'd some Passages out of *Anastasius Sinaite*, *Germane Patriarch of Constantinople*, *Damasen*, the second Council of *Nice*, *Theophylact*, *Euthymius*, *Nicholas Methonienfis*, *Feremias*, and some others. 'Tis true he conjectured that the Error of the Western people has communicated it self to several of those of the East, towards the end of the twelfth Century, there having bin a more free Commerce between them after the Conquest of the Holy Land. Yet has he sufficiently shew'd, that altho the Expressions of the modern Greeks, appeared to him Obscure, Excessive, and Different from those of the Ancients, yet did he not believe, they embraced the Transubstantiation of the *Latins*, and 'tis upon this ground, that speaking of *Cyrillus*, he say's that he returned to the ancient Faith, and spake better of this Mystery than others. This shews us he observed there was more Confusion and Ambiguity in the others, and more Plainness and Distinctness in the Patriarch *Cyrillus*, but not that he believed the Greek Church received the Doctrine of the Substantial Conversion, nor that she held the Substance of Bread ceases, for he expressly maintains the contrary.

ALL the rest of Mr. *Arnaud*'s Discourse consisting only of Heats and Invectives against me, and my Cause receiving no Prejudice thereby, I freely make thereof a Sacrifice to piety, and Christian Meekness.

## C H A P. V.

*Mr. Arnaud's negative Arguments drawn from the Silence of the Greeks and Latins, on the Article of Transubstantiation Examined.*

**A**LTHO the third order of Proofs which Mr. *Arnaud* has made use of, consists to speak properly, only in one single Argument, yet this Argument takes up as much room as all the rest of the Dispute. Mr. *Arnaud* has so great love for this Proof, that he is never weary with offering it us. He concludes all his Histories with it, he makes it the matter of most of his Chapters, and the perpetual Subject of his Reflections: If he explains to us the Sentiments of *Theophylact*, *Euthymius*, *Casillas*, *Simeon Thessalonienfis*, he forgets not to observe they did not Believe that the *Greeks* had any other Faith than the *Latins*, touching the Eucharist, seeing they made no mention of it: If he relates to us the Conquests which the *Latins* made in the *East* during the twelv<sup>th</sup> Century, he fails not to conclude thence, that the *Greeks* and they, not reproaching one another on this Subject, 'tis a Sign they were agreed in it: If he reckons up to us other *Greeks* who wrote against the Roman Church, or *Latins* that wrote against the *Greeks*, 'tis only to draw this Consequence thence, that there having never bin any Controversie touching Transubstantiation, 'tis a Sign these two Churches were agreed in that point: If he has Occasion to mention the taking of *Constantinople*, and the Establishment of the *Latins* in the Greek Empire, one of the Uses he makes thereof, is before to let's know, that seeing there was no publick Dispute on the Article of the Substantial Conversion, they all equally Believed it. 'Tis for this purpose he relates the Treaties of Agreement, Formularies of Reunions, and what passed in the Council of *Lyons* and *Florence*. In fine, this is his dearly beloved Argument which he Repeats a hundred times over, without any Alteration but that of the Terms, and Circumstances he represents it withal.

I T must be acknowledged Mr. *Arnaud* has some reason to please himself in this Proof, and to bring it in again so often as he does, for this is the most specious and best coloured Pretence in the whole Dispute, altho at bottom, there will be found no Solidity in it. Which I shall demonstrate in this Chapter, in which I hope to shew clearly the Nullity of his Consequence drawn from the Silence of the *Greeks*. For this effect, I shall make use of two sorts of Means, the one shall shew that there is not only a great deal of Weakness, but Falsity in his Argument, the rest discover wherein this Weakness and Falsity do consist, the one shall be more General and less Direct, the others Particular and Direct.

I. FIRST it may here seem strange that Mr. *Arnaud* who so strictly urges the Silence of the *Greeks* and *Latins*, does not remember what the Author of the *Perpetuity* answered to my Proof drawn from the Silence of the *Pagans*, who upbraided not the Primitive Christians with Transubstantiation, and the Consequence I drew from the Silence of the Fathers, who mention not a word

word of the many Miracles which Transubstantiation Includes in it. *Who knows not, says he, in general how weak these kind of Probabilities are, and that there are abundance of things which might be said by the Pagans, or Fathers, which never came to our Knowledge?* And a little farther, *Books contain the least part of Mens Thoughts and Discourses. 'Tis Chance, or some particular Accident which determines them to conserve to Posterity some one of their Thoughts, suffering abundance of others to be lost, which were more common to them, and many times more important. Perhaps, says he, the Pagans never discoursed of the Eucharist, and perhaps again they did.* How comes it to pass that in so short a time the negative Argument, which was in my Hands but a weak Probability, becomes in those of Mr. Arnaud a puissant Demonstration? The things which were said by the Greeks or Latins during three or four hundred Years, are no more come to our Knowledge, than the Discourses of the Pagans, or those of the Fathers, and the Books which have bin written touching these two Churches the Latin and the Greek, contain no more mens Thoughts than those which were written concerning the Pagans, or those the Fathers wrote on the Subject of Christian Religion.

*Perp. of the  
Faith Refut.  
1. part. p. 121.  
122, 123.*

IT seems these Gentlemen Consult only their own Interest: When any Authors favour them, they are worthy of publick Praise, and when they do not, they deserve to be Contemned, and their Arguments become strong or weak, good or bad, accordingly as they are serviceable, or otherwise. It is certain if Mr. Arnaud's and my Proof be compared together in respect of Form, they are equal; for we suppose the same Principles, and draw thence the same Consequences; but if they be compared in respect of the matter, the Advantage is wholly on my side, for all the Circumstances strengthen my Argument, whereas they weaken his. The Pagans were Learned, they had the Power in their Hands, they needed not dissemble with the Christians: They knew very well the Doctrines of Christianity. The matter concerned the pulling down of their Altars, and they were interested to conserve their ancient Religion, to decry these Novelties which had introduced themselves into the World. There can be nothing said like this, concerning the Greeks, as will appear in the Sequel of this Chapter: And yet my Argument is not Conclusive in the Author of the *Perpetuity's* Judgment, and Mr. Arnaud's Argument, if we believe himself, is undeniably Evident; that is to say, these Gentlemen bestow on Arguments, when they are pleased to make use of them, the Title of good ones, but when the same Arguments are urged against them then they become bad ones. This partiality proceeds only from prejudice.

BUT in the second place, without wandring from the Subject in Hand, I can oppose against Mr. Arnaud's negative Proof, several other Proofs of the like kind I have already made use of in the preceding Book, which conclude with a thousand times more strength than his, and consequently deserve to be preferred before them, according to the Rules of right Reason. The Greeks in explaining the Mystery of the Eucharist, do assert neither the Existence of Accidents without a Subject, nor the Concomitancy, or Existence of the Body of Christ in the Eucharist after the manner of Spirits, nor his Existence in several places. They trouble not themselves with inquiring how our Bodies are nourished when they receive the Sacrament, nor of what matter the Worms are formed which are bred in the Eucharist, nor several other Questions. In short they mention not a Word touching any of the natural Consequences of Transubstantiation, which a man cannot but consider, and

N n

which



which common Sense discovers without the help of any Philosophy; as I already shewed in the tenth Chapter of the foregoing Book.

ALL that I now desire is, that my negative Proofs be compared with that Proof Mr. *Arnaud* draws from the *Greeks* not making Transubstantiation a point of Controversy between them and the *Latins*. The *Greeks*, say's he, have bin silent on the Transubstantiation of the *Latins*, they neither opposed nor condemned it; therefore they believed it as well as the *Latins*. The *Greeks*, say I, have for Example bin silent on the Existence of the Accidents of Bread separated from their proper Substance, they neither handled this Point, nor so much as made mention of it, therefore they do not believe it, nor consequently Transubstantiation. Mr. *Arnaud* must acknowledg that my Proof is far more conclusive than his, for 'tis a thousand times more natural for people that hold the Substance of Bread ceases, and yet and tast behold all the Qualities, and Properties thereof to consider how these things subsist, or at least to speak in some sort of it, than 'tis natural to those that do not believe Transubstantiation, to reproach them with it, that do believe it. If we weigh all Circumstances, we shall find, the Commerce the Greek Doctors have had either with their own people, or with themselves, in reflecting on what fell under their Sense, has bin more particular and frequent than that which they have had with the *Latins*. That which they saw and believed has bin more distinctly known to them, than what the *Latins* taught, or *Gregory* the VII, or *Innocent* the III. determin'd in their Councils. The Interest of quieting their own Consciences and satisfying their own Minds, must needs be more prevalent with them, than that of quarrelling with the *Latins*. The occasions of satisfying themselves, and instructing their people ofner presented themselves, than those of condemning strangers, with whom they dealt only by their Ambassadors and Interpreters. The reasons of their Silence, in respect of the *Latins*, are easlyer found out, than those which would oblige them to be silent, in respect of themselves. For what signifies the telling us the Glory of God, and Respect to his Mysteries were the cause of their Silence touching the Existence of the Accidents without a Subject; For this same Glory of God, and respect to his Mysteries would engage them to declare the reasons of their Silence, to the end they may be known to all the Faithful under their Charge, and to exhort them to the same Silence. Were I willing to enlarge my Book after Mr. *Arnaud's* Example, who has hunted after little Stories whereby to bring over again a hundred times the same Argument, I should tire my Readers Patience, for I could argue touching all the Occasions the *Greeks* have had to see, and administer the Eucharist, to discourse, and partake of it, the *Easters* in which time the people do universally Communicate, touching the Sick that desire it, and received it, the Books wherein they explain'd the Mystery of it; and in general touching whatsoever may administer them an Occasion of considering the Accidents, and I might as often draw this Conclusion that they do not believe Transubstantiation, seeing they have said nothing concerning this pretended Miracle of the Existence of Accidents separated from their Subject.

'TIS the same with the other Consequences of the substantial Conversion. A Man needs only his Eye-sight to assure himself that if what we receive in the *Eucharist* be really and substantially the natural Body of Christ, according to the Sense of the *Latins*, it is not in the usual form of a humane Body; whence there immediately arises this Consideration, how it can be without this Form. How it can be in a place after an unlocal manner, neither palpable,

ble, nor divisible, thus more like a Spirit than a Body, and yet without Motion, Sense, or Action, and in this more like an inanimate Body than a Spirit. A Man needs but little Sense to comprehend, that if the Substance of Bread ceases, there can be nothing found in the *Eucharist* to which may be attributed the effect of the Nourishment we receive thence. Neither needs there much Study to find out, that if the Substance of the natural Body of Christ be present in the Sacrament, he is then in several places at the same time, to wit, in Heaven, and on all the Altars whereon are celebrated this divine Mystery; Yet do they make no mention of these things.

WE have seen that one of their Opinions is, that the Wicked do not receive Christ's Body in the Sacrament. Now every Man sees this Doctrine does not well agree with Transubstantiation, in as much, as that on one Hand, 'tis held the Bread is made the Body of the Son of God in propriety of Substance, and on the other, that the Wicked in receiving it, eat not this Body. Whence it follows according to all Rules of Sense, that they are obliged to endeavour to make these two Opinions agree, and remove the contrariety which appears betwixt them. Yet so far are they from troubling themselves about this, that we find not this Contrariety, (whether real or imaginary) ever entered into their Thoughts.

NOW let any Man compare the Arguments we draw from their Silence touching all these Consequences, with that of Mr. *Arnaud's*; and faithfully tell us, whether ours are not more Conclusive and Evident than his. We have proposed several things which the *Greeks* might know without any Study, Reflection, Attention of Mind, Legats, and Interpreters, only by the sight of their Eyes, and help of common Sense; Affairs which were neither carried on by Intrigues, Negotiations, nor publick Respects; and wherein the Silence of the *Greeks* is certain, there being no likelihood but if they spake of 'em, we should be soon made to know it, and concerning which, in fine, they could not be silent as they are, without doing a notable Prejudice to Religion, and an extraordinary Violence to Nature. Whereas Mr. *Arnaud* only offers us one thing, which can scarcely be known by any but the Learned, and which requires also great attention of Mind, and reading; a matter which for the most part was in the hands of some Deputies, and managed by the help of Interpreters, wherein Intrigues and Interests, Complacency and Fear, and other humane Passions have great share, and touching which we cannot be assured whether the Silence of the *Greeks* be truly such as 'tis represented to us, seeing we have no more of their Writings but what the *Latins* were pleased to give us. A matter in fine, in which the *Greeks* might be silent without offering any Violence to themselves, and without believing they did any Wrong to their Religion. I shall show this more largely hereafter, what I now mention'd being only to facilitate the comparison of my Proofs with that of Mr. *Arnaud's*, to the end the Readers may more clearly and exactly judge of them.

III. IN the third place, it is necessary that my first Proofs which I offered in the foregoing Book, be remembred, which were taken from that the *Greeks* do not teach the Doctrine of Transubstantiation in expresse terms, I mean the substantial Conversion asserted by the *Latins*; that they receive not the Councils which have determined it, that they will not use the term of *metemorphosis*, that they explain themselves only in general Terms, which may be understood in another Sense, and which at farthest can admit only

of a general Sence; and that Mr. *Arnaud* is constrain'd to betake himself to Consequences and Arguings to render their Expressions favourable. It is likewise requisite that the Reader call to mind the solid Grounds on which my Proofs are built, and the Testimonies I have produced on this Subject, and on the other Hand, the Illusions I discovered in Mr. *Arnaud's* Dispute, as well in the formulary of the Reunion with which he has made such a noise, as the Testimonys of *Samonas*, *Acapius*, the Baron of *Spataris*, *Paysius Ligari-dius*, the Synod of *Cyprus*, and that of some Priests in the Patriarchate of *Antioch*; for the Truth of my Principle results from the Examination of all these things, the rest of Mr. *Arnaud's* Proofs consisting only in Arguings and Consequences. I would likewise desire the Reader to compare his negative Argument with mine, and judg which of the two Consequences is the better. The *Greeks* (say I) when they explain the Mystery of the *Eucharist*, use not the Term of Transubstantiation, nor teach the thing which this Term signifies, they own not the Councils that have determin'd it; and in the rejection of them never except this Article, nor shew by any thing else they are agreed in it. They do not then believe the substantial Conversion of the *Latins*. Mr. *Arnaud* say's on the contrary; the *Greeks* reproach not the *Latins* with Transubstantiation, they make not a Dispute thereof, they condemn it not as an Error; they then Believe it. I say that my Consequence is evident, certain, immediate, and necessary, whereas Mr. *Arnaud's* has none of these Qualities. My Consequence is evident, for 'tis evident a whole Church that believes the Conversion of the Substance of Bread into the Substance of the Body of Christ, and would have her Children Believe it, must needs teach it them in clear and distinct Terms, and such as are able to form the *Idea* which she would have them conceive of it; But the Greek Church does not do this; therefore she does not believe it. For it would be prodigiously strange that a Church had, concerning the Change which happens in the *Eucharist*, a Belief as distinct and determinate, as is that of the Conversion of one Substance into another; and yet, could not, or would not explain her self in clear and distinct Terms, altho she finds them already made to her Hands, in the Language of a Church with whom she agrees in this Point. But this the Greek Church does not do; She does not thus explain her self, She has not then this Belief. My Consequence is immediate; for the first and most immediate Obligation, the first and most immediate Effect which arises from the Belief of Transubstantiation in a Church that holds it, is that of teaching it, and explaining how she believes it, that is to say distinctly, for it cannot be believed otherwise than distinctly: But the Greek Church does not explain her self distinctly; She does not then believe it. I say in fine, that 'tis necessary: For there is nothing that can hinder the Greek Church from expounding clearly and plainly this Opinion, if she held it: Not the Ignorance of proper Expressions, for besides that they are easily met with, the Roman Church furnishes her with them, not the Fear of scandalizing her People, for the Church of *Rome* asserts these People have held this Doctrine ever since Christianity was first planted amongst them, not the fear of scandalizing the Infidels, for the *Turks* amongst whom the *Greeks* live, suffer all sorts of Religions, and the *Latins* who were mixt with them, and who scruple not to explain themselves clearly on this Doctrine, have long since taken away this Pretence from the *Greeks*; the fear of offending their Emperors when they had 'em, could not withhold them, for the Greek Emperors as we have already seen, have almost all of 'em favoured the *Latins*. Much less moreover can it be said they were hindred by the Fear of the Roman Church, and its Power, for this was a means on the contrary to obtain her Favour. And yet notwithstanding



standing all this the *Greeks* do not assert this Doctrine in clear and distinct Terms; therefore they hold it not.

NOW let a man reflect on the Consequence Mr. *Arnaud* draws, and he will find that it has none of these Qualities which I come now from observing in mine. It is not evident, for what Certainty is there that if a Church does not imbrace a Doctrine, she must therefore immediately condemn it, and make thereof a matter of Controversy? This Proposition taken in its generality is not only unevident, but false, and contrary to the Principles of Reason and Scripture. Being applyed in particular to Transubstantiation, it has no Evidence, for it must be supposed that a Church which does not believe it, considers it in a due manner, whereby to judg that 'tis a damnable Error, and that she wants not Knowledge for the making of this Judgment; and supposing she wants not Knowledge whereby to make this Judgment, we must farther suppose that she believes her self obliged to pass this Censure, against a Church from which she is actually separated. We must besides this, suppose she has Courage enough to do her Duty, and that no humane Respect can withhold her from it. Now it cannot be show'd that these three Suppositions are evident in respect of the *Greeks*, whence it appears that Mr. *Arnaud's* Consequence is of no certainty; for what Certainty is there in a Consequence that depends on three Suppositions, which are not only very uncertain, but false, as will appear upon Examination. Neither is it likewise immediate, for 'tis certain there is no medium between believing Transubstantiation, and clearly explaining it, in respect of a Church which is at full liberty to speak on it what she thinks: But betwixt not believing it, and making thereof a point of Controversy with Strangers that do believe it, there's a vast difference. In fine, I say this Consequence has no necessity, for it might bin hindred by a thousand things, through want of learned Men able to mannage this Controversy, by the temporal Interests of their Empire, and Church, and fear of provoking the *Latins*, who have bin almost continually their Masters, by the Intrigues of their Emperours, and several of their Patriarchs and Bishops; but especially by a Spirit of Superstition which has occasioned long since the turning of Religion into childish Ceremonies, neglecting the Essentials of Christianity to apply themselves to Fopperies.

TO Illustrate more clearly this Comparison, which I desire the Reader to make, between Mr. *Arnaud's* negative Arguments and mine, it will be convenient to make here a general Reflection on the state of our Controversy. The Question between us is to know whether the *Greeks* believe Transubstantiation, or not; Mr. *Arnaud* has undertaken to prove the Affirmative, and I the Negative. Now this being so, it is evident I am only obliged to prove my Thesis by negative Arguments. The *Greeks* teach not Transubstantiation, nor its necessary and natural Consequences: therefore they do not believe it. This concludes very well according to the nature of the Thesis which I defend, and this Proof is sufficient to satisfy a mans Mind, and decide the Question. But 'tis not the same with Mr. *Arnaud*, for he is obliged to prove his Proposition, not so much by the Silence of these People, as by their Words, not so much by negative Arguments, as by positive ones. The *Greeks* say's he, believe Transubstantiation; which is what he ought to shew by affirmative Arguments: Were then the Conclusion he draws from the Silence of the *Greeks*, more probable than 'tis, yet could it not perswade by it self any reasonable Person. Our Minds might be perplexed with it, but yet 'twill be still said, we must examine what the *Greeks* positively teach touching the Eucha-

rist,

*rist*, and see how they explain themselves concerning it, because this is the just and only means of deciding the Question. In effect, if it be true the *Greeks* teach Transubstantiation, the negative Arguments drawn from their not making a Controversy of it with the *Latins*, are superfluous; the matter is decided, and we need go no farther; but if it be true on the contrary that they do not teach it, the negative Arguments are of no Consequence, we must keep to what we find contained in their form of Doctrine. It is then certain there is more show than real solidity in this part of Mr. *Arnaud's* Dispute, and that 'tis more likely to divert the Fancy, than satisfy the Judgment. It may dazzle our Eyes by a false appearance, but cannot instruct us, for it decides nothing, a man still remains in the desire and necessity of knowing what the *Greeks* teach. If he satisfies this Desire, 'tis sufficient, but if not, his negative Arguments signify nothing. Mr. *Arnaud* then might well have spared all those Histories, Accounts of Reunions, and the enumeration of all the Authors that have treated on the Differences between the *Greeks* and *Latins*. All which has bin to no purpose, seeing that when we have bestowed never so much time on the Discussion of these things, we must return again to the principal Point, which is to know positively what the *Greeks* teach concerning the *Eucharist*. For as I now said, Mr. *Arnaud's* Proposition being affirmative, to wit, that the *Greeks* believe Transubstantiation, he must clearly establish it by affirmative Proofs; for 'tis on these alone, whereon depends the decision of the Question, and not on negative Arguments, drawn from what they do not do.

AND thus far touching my general means: Come we now to Particulars. Mr. *Arnaud* pretends that if the *Greeks* have not heretofore believed Transubstantiation, nor yet still believe it, they ought to make it a point of Controversy with the *Latins*. I answer, the *Greeks* contented themselves with keeping their own Belief concerning the Sacrament, and held to their usual Expressions, and have not admitted the Determinations of *Gregory* the VII. or *Innocent* the III. nor the Doctrine of the Council of *Trent*; and yet never proceeded to a formal Condemnation of the Sentiment of the *Latins*, nor made it a matter of Dispute and Controversy. In a word, they do neither believe, nor oppose Transubstantiation: They do not believe it, for it is not to be seen in the Doctrine of their Church; in their Confessions of Faith, Books of Divinity, Decisions of their Councils, Liturgies, Catechisms, nor Sermons; neither do they oppose it, for as far as we can find, they never disputed this Point with the *Latins*, nor formally debated it in their ancient Differences. I say, as far as we can find, for 'tis impossible but some have Disputed on it, altho all Records thereof have bin lost, or suppressed, seeing none of them ever came to our Knowledge. But be it as it will, at worst, it only concerns us to know whether my Answer is reasonable, and whether in effect the *Greeks* not believing the Conversion of Substances, 'tis possible they have not condemned this Opinion in the Church of *Rome*. Now I maintain this is not only possible, but most probable: whence it follows that Mr. *Arnaud's* Argument is neither Conclusive in *genere necessario* nor *probabili* (as the Schools speak) when we nearly examine it.

I. To shew this, I first of all produce the Example of the Church of *Rome* it self, which condemns not several Opinions which she knows are held by particular Persons, and even by whole Societies too under her Jurisdiction, and yet does not receive them, nor approve of them. She keeps Silence in their respect, for Reasons best known to her self, yet would not have it argued from her

her Silence, so resolutely as Mr. *Arnaud* does from that of the *Greeks*. The Question whether the Infallibility resides in the Pope, or Council, has remain'd hitherto undetermined, several Persons still debate it, and we know which side the Court of *Rome* favours; yet we cannot positively say that they have condemned, or opposed as an Error, the Opinion of those who prefer the Council above the Pope; and yet, they will be loath men should argue from their Silence. How long has the Church of *Rome* suffered the Sentiment of the *Dominicans* touching the Conception of the Virgin, without opposing or condemning it, altho she does not approve of it? This Consequence drawn by Mr. *Arnaud* is so little solid, and if I may say the Truth, so captious, that *Innocent* the X. advised us not to abuse thus the Silence of Persons; for in his Constitutions wherein he condemns the five Propositions supposed to be taken out of *Jansenius* his Writings, he expressly declares that altho he has only condemned these five Propositions, yet he would not have any Man think he approves by his Silence the rest of that Book. If I say then that the *Greeks* in disputing only on some Articles, never pretended to approve by their Silence on the rest of the Religion of the *Latins*, much less in particular of the Doctrine of the substantial Conversion, I assert nothing but what may be judged Reasonable from the Church of *Rome*'s own Example, and Maxim of Pope *Innocent* himself.

IT will not be amiss to observe two things in these Examples I now instanced, the one, that the Point before us is concerning what passed in the very Bosom of the Roman Church, between Persons that belonged to it, and whom she is obliged to instruct and reduce into the right way; and 'thother that she had just cause to fear, lest under the Favour of this Toleration, the Error would communicate it self to several Persons, and in fine, the whole Body of the People be infected with it. Now the first of these things has no place in reference to the *Greeks*, for the Point before us does not concern an Opinion sprung up in their Church, but in a forrain and separate one, and over which they pretend no Jurisdiction. As to the second thing, I confess, had the *Greeks* reflected, as they ought, on this their Silence, they could not but perceive that the *Latins* (who make advantage of every thing) would not fail to endeavour the bringing in of Transubstantiation into *Greece*, under the benefit of this Silence, and take from thence occasion to perswade simple People that the two Churches are agreed in this particular. But how manifest soever this Danger was, it is clear that that wherein the Church of *Rome* ventures her self, in suffering those Opinions to take root which she tolerates in her own Bosom, is yet more evident; and yet notwithstanding she remains Silent: Which shews the Vanity of Mr. *Arnaud*'s Consequence. For if the Roman Church can suffer Opinions in the very midst of her, which she does not approve, why cannot the *Greeks* use the same Forbearance towards an Opinion of the *Latins*, and if we may not conclude from the Church of *Rome*'s not opposing a Doctrine, that she holds it, or teaches it, why may we not make the same Conclusion in respect of the *Greeks*?

II. IN the second place, I instance in several other important Articles, wherein the *Greeks* do not agree with the *Latins*, and yet we do not find they made them a matter of Dispute any more than Transubstantiation. For Example, the *Greeks* believe the Pains of the Damned, are eased by the Prayers of the living. They farther believe that so great is the efficacy of their Prayers, that they sometimes deliver these Wretches absolutely from their Torments, and rescue them from Damnation. They are, say's *Allatins*, extremely



*Allat. Diff. 2. de lib. Eccl. Grec.* treably fond of this Opinion, that the Prayers of good People profit the Infidels and those condemned to eternal Misery, and that they are eased, and sometimes wholly delivered by them. Which he proves by several Passages in their Triode (which is one of their ecclesiastical Books) and other their most famous Authors. The Latins are of a contrary Opinion. It is certain, say's *Bellarmin*, that the Prayers of the Church are beneficial neither to the Blessed in Heaven, nor Damned in Hell, but only to the Souls in Purgatory: Which Doctrine is held by all the Schoolmen that follow *St. Austin's* Opinion. Yet do we not find the two Churches ever made a Point of Controversy thereof, or charged one another with Errour, about it. We do not find this Question was agitated when the Unions were in hand, whether in the Council of Florence or elsewhere, nor mention made of it in the Confession of Faith which the Popes so often sent them, in order to an agreement.

*Allat. Diff. 2. de Pentecost.* THE afore said *Allatius* observes another Opinion of the *Greeks*, which has some Relation with that I now mention'd. For they believe that when our Saviour descended into Hell, he preached his Gospel to all the Dead, as well to the Damned as Saints, and saved from amongst them all those that believed in his Word, and raised them up. It appears from the Passages produced by *Allatius*, as well out of their *Pentecostare*, (which is one of their Church Books,) as other Writings, that this is their Opinion: Whereas on the contrary 'tis evident, this is not the Opinion of the *Latins*, for they look upon it as Erroneous and Heretical. None of the damned Souls, say's *Bellarmin*, were delivered: For *Philastrius* and *St. Augustin*, say 'tis Heretical, to assert that any of the Wicked were converted and saved by *Christ's* preaching in Hell. *Allatius* adds, that *St. Ireneas* and *Epiphanius* condemned this Errour in *Marcion*, and that *Gregory* the I. who lived towards the end of the sixth Century, censured it likewise as an Heresy in the Persons of *George* and *Theodorus*, the one a Priest, and th'other a Deacon of the Church of *Constantinople*. Now altho the Difference which is between the two Churches on this Article is manifest, yet we do not find they made thereof a Controversy, or that the Authors on either side wrote one against another on this Subject, nor any mention of it in the Reunions.

*Metroph. Confess. Eccl. Orient. C 7.* WE may moreover reckon amongst the Differences of the two Churches, the Rejection which the *Greek* makes of several Books in the Bible, which they esteem Apocryphal, whereas the *Latins* receive them, as Canonical Scripture. For 'tis certain the *Greeks* follow in this point the sixtieth Canon of the of Council *Laodicea*, and the Authority of *John Damascen*, as appears by the Testimony of *Metrophanius Cytropulus*, who reckoning up the number of Canonical Books, which he say's are thirty three in all, has these Words. As to other Books which some admit into the Canon of Scripture, as the Books of *Toby*, *Judith*, *Wisdom of Solomon*, of *Jesus Son of Sirach*, *Baruc*, and the *Maccabees*; We do not believe they ought to be wholly rejected, seeing they contain severat excellent moral Precepts. But to receive them as Canonical and Authentick Writings, is what the Church of *Christ* never did, as several Doctors testify, and amongst others *St. Gregory the Divine*, *St. Amphilocus*, and after them *St. John Damascen*. And therefore we ground not our Doctrines on their Authority, but on that of the thirty three Canonical Books. So that here is the Opinion of the *Greeks* very opposite to that of the *Latins*, and yet we do not find they made a point of Controversy of this Difference, nor any mention of it in their Reunions.

WE can give another Instance to the same purpose, and that touching the *Eucharist* too. The *Greeks* since the seventh Century, reject the terms of Type, Figure, and Image, but the *Latins* use them, and yet they never made this a point of Controversy betwixt them. It cannot be said they slighted this Point; for when they explain themselves thereon, they add to their Rejection a form of Detestation. *God forbid, say's Anastasius Sinaite, that we should say the Holy Communion is the Figure of Christ's Body. God forbid, say's Damascen, we should think the Bread and Wine are the Figure of Christ's Body, and Blood.* Yet how averse soever they have bin to this way of speaking, they never objected this as a Crime to the *Latins*, nor accused them of Error in this matter.

WE can Instance in several other Examples of Differences between the two Churches, about which the *Greeks* never fell out with the *Latins*; but those I already denoted are sufficient to shew Mr. *Arnaud* the nullity of his Consequence, and at the same time the possibility of my Proposition: For why may not Transubstantiation bin passed over in Silence, as well as other Articles? Why must the negative Argument which is of no validity in these particulars, be good in that of Transubstantiation? If the *Greeks* could remain in their own Opinions, and keep their Belief to themselves touching the Damned, and Christ's preaching to them, touching the number of Canonical Books, &c. without entring into Debate with the *Latins*, and charging them with Error in these Points, why may not the same have hapned touching the Change relating to the *Eucharist*.

MR. *Arnaud* will reply without doubt, the Doctrine of Transubstantiation is a Point of greater Importance, than those I now mentioned, and therefore it might well happen that these slight and inconsiderable Matters were never disputed of; but that we must not suppose the same Moderation in reference to the substantial Conversion, which holds a higher rank in Religion. I answer, first it cannot be said these Articles I mentioned are of small Importance. For as to the first of them, it is of great Importance to Christian Piety, not to give this Encouragement to the Wicked, that live how they will, they may hope to be delivered one day from the Pains of Hell. As to the second, it has bin already reckoned amongst the Number of Heresies, by St. *Irenæus*, *Epiphanius*, *Philastrius*, St. *Austin*, and *Gregory* the great. The third concerns the Canon of Holy Scriptures, which ought to rule our Faith, and the fourth is attended with the Execration of the *Greeks*. These things then cannot be slighted as small and inconsiderable Matters. But in the second place I answer, to judge rightly of the Importance of Transubstantiation, we must consider it, not in it self, nor in relation to our present Disputes, but to the *Greeks* and their Disputes with the *Latins*; which is to say, we should consider what Judgment Persons plunged in Ignorance, could make of it, and whose whole Religion, almost wholly consists of *Grimaces* and superstitious Ceremonies; who have lived hitherto in Disorders and perpetual Confusions, and have had the *Latins* continually to deal with, and bin forced to accommodate themselves with them as much as possible; who never found Transubstantiation amongst the Points about which the two Churches disputed in the beginning, and separated afterwards, in fine, Persons with whom the *Latins* never openly quarrelled about this Article, but agreed with them in certain general Terms. Let any Man consider whether Persons in these Circumstances are capable of making all due Reflections on the Opinion of the *Latins*, and examining the Importance and Weight of this Difference,

rence, which is between the Doctrines of the two Churches. Let any Man judg whether 'tis impossible they should abstain to make thereof a particular Controversy, and content themselves with their own Opinion, and Expressions, without concerning themselves with other People's.

*Jacob. a Viro  
bist. Orient.  
cap. 76.*

*Vallim. lib. 2.  
cap. 21.*

*Itinerar. Hiero-  
sol. Fua. Cotto-  
ric. lib. 2. c. 6.*

III. I produce in the third place, Examples of the Silence of the same *Greeks*, touching some Opinions of other Eastern Christians, who have a nearer Commerce with them than the *Latins*, and yet we do not find they reproach them with their Opinions, nor dispute with them about 'em. The *Jacobites* reject the Custom of confessing their Sins to the Priest. *They hold another Error, say's De Virry, which is no less an Error than that of Circumcising their Children, which is, that they do not confess their Sins to the Priest, but to God alone in Secret. They confess not their Sins to any Man, say's Villamont, but to God alone in private: They cannot indure to hear of auricular Confession, say's Boucher, but when they have committed any Fault that troubles their Consciences, they confess themselves to God alone. They do not allow of the sacramental Confession, say's Cottovic, altho 'tis admitted by both the Greeks and Latins, saying we must confess our Sins to God, who only knows the Hearts of Men. The Jacobites are dispersed over all Palestine, Syria, Egypt and all the rest of the East. One of their Patriarchs resides at Aleppo, and they have an apartment, as well as the other Christians, in the Church of the Holy Sepulcher at Jerusalem, and consequently hold a perpetual Commerce with the Greeks. And yet do I not find the Greeks have ever disputed with them about auricular Confession, nor denoted the Rejection they make thereof, as if it was an Error, Damascen mentions them in the Treatise he wrote of Heresies. He remarks their Opinion touching the Unity of our Saviour's Nature, but mentions not a Word of Confession. Nicephorus Callistus observes likewise in his Ecclesiastical History, their Heresy touching the Unity of our Saviour's Nature, but takes no notice of their rejecting the Article of Confession.*

THE *Nestorians* which are another Christian Church in the *East*, and have as well as others their apartment in the Temple of the Holy Sepulchre at *Jerusalem*, and are consequently continually amongst the *Greeks* in this place, where their common Devotion brings them, do acknowledg no more than the *Jacobites* the Doctrine of Confession, nor that of Confirmation, as appears by the Profession of Faith of *Sulak* their Patriarch, which is inserted in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*. Let Mr. Arnaud shew us if he can, that the *Greeks* have raised any Controversies on this Subject; he I say that believes these latter, are at agreement with the *Latins* touching the number of seven Sacraments.

*Thom. a Jesu.  
lib. 7. part. 2.  
c. 7.*

THOMAS a Jesu tells us that the Pope having sent Apostolical Legats for the Reforming of the *Maronites*, and purging their Books from some Errors, which were common to them, say's he, as well as to other Eastern Nations, that is to say other Christians in that Country, they found they misunderstood some Passages of Scripture, and especially that touching the Institution of the Sacrament, this is my Body. *They affirm, say's he, that we must read, this is the Sacrament of my Body.* Let Mr. Arnaud be pleased to tell us whether the *Greeks* ever censured the Proposition of these other Eastern Churches in the midst of whom they live. For if it be true that the *Greeks* believed Transubstantiation as well as the *Latins*, 'tis the strangest thing in the World they should approve such a Corruption, or such an Interpretation of the Words of Christ, seeing 'tis only on the literal Sence of these Words



Words the Church of *Rome* pretends her Doctrine is grounded.

I shall prove in its place, as clearly as 'tis possible to prove a thing of this nature, that the *Armenians* do not believe Transubstantiation, nor the substantial Presence. This Truth will be plainly manifest, and yet it will not appear the *Greeks* ever upbraided them with this their Opinion, or made thereof a Point of Controversy. Were it fair to argue from the Silence of the *Greeks*, might I not conclude from their not disturbing the *Armenians* in reference to this matter, that they are agreed with them to reject these Doctrines, and conclude it too with a thousand times more Strength and Evidence, than Mr. *Arnaud* concludes they are at Agreement with the *Latins* to believe it, because they do not make thereof a Controversy.

AND here methinks are Instances enough to overthrow Mr. *Arnaud's* Argument, and discover the weakness of his Consequence. But we must proceed farther, for having shewed him that the Principle on which I ground my Answer is reasonable, to wit, that the *Greeks* do not believe Transubstantiation, altho they never disputed against it, I will likewise shew him there is all the likelihood in the World that the matter is as I lay it down, whence it will follow that not only his Consequence has no Necessity, but even no Probability.

I. FOR this Effect it will be necessary to call to mind the profound Ignorance wherein the *Greeks* have lived from the eleventh Century, till this present. For I already related in the second Book what *Wm. of Tyre*, *James de Vitry*, *Belon*, *Cottovic*, *Anthony Cautus*, *Francis Richard*, *Allatius du Loir*, *Thevenot*, and *Barbereau* the Jesuit have written of this matter. I moreover produced the Testimonies of *Bozins*, and *Thomas a Jesu*. All which has no other end but to shew us the miserable Condition wherein this Church has for so long time layn. Observe here likewise what say's a Latiniz'd Monk called *Barlaam*, who lived about the beginning of the fourteenth Century. There are, say's he, few Persons amongst them that trouble themselves with Learning: And there are yet fewer that apply themselves to the Study of the Scriptures, preferring the Heathenish Sciences above it, to which they willingly apply themselves. All the People in general are ignorant especially of that Holy Word that brings Salvation; So that for one Person amongst them that understands the Summary of the Christian Faith, there are Millions ignorant of it. Observe here moreover what *Cyrillus Lucaris* (the same Patriarch mentioned in the preceding Book) writes. I can bear with the Ignorance of the common People, for I know their Ignorance and Simplicity can defend them against the Enemies of their Faith, whom they Combat not with Arms, but Patience, and so remain faithful to Jesus Christ. But I cannot bear with the Ignorance and Stupidity of our Pastors and Bishops; and therefore I continually upbraid them with it, but to no purpose. The Jesuits making their advantage thereof, have settled themselves in Constantinople to instruct Youth, and are like Foxes amongst Geese. It is certain we can find no Book from this People worth our Reading, written since *Photius's* time, excepting some few Histories, and Collections of the antient Canons, the rest only consisting in Explanations of their Liturgy, and some pittiful Treatises, wherein they Transcribe one out of another Word for Word, without any Art, or Sense almost.

*Barlaam Epist.*  
1. Bibl. parv.  
Tom. 2. Edit. 4.

*Epist. ad Wirtzemborg in Epist. Viro crudi.*

II. WE should likewise consider the temporal State of *Greece* since the eleventh Century to this present, for there can be nothing imagined more dreadful

dreadful and miserable. Most of their Emperors have been either lazy or effeminate, continually accompanied with Misfortunes, or Prophan and Impious Persons that made a Mock of Religion, or Villains that ascended the Throne by Seditions and Murthers, by means whereof Greece became divided into Faſtions and horrible Confuſions. In the Year 1034, *Romanus Argirus* the Emperor having loſt Syria, was cruelly murdered by the Treachery of *Zoa* his Wife, who gave the Empire afterwards to her Adulterer *Michael*. *Michael* Reigned ſeven Years poſſeſſed by the evil Spirit: He loſt *Sicily* and *Bulgarya*, and at length turned Monk in the Year 1041. *Zoa* his Wife adopted one *Michael Calaphatus*, and made him Emperor; but four or five Months after, ſhe cauſed his Eyes to be bored out, and gave the Empire to *Conſtantine Monomaque* whom ſhe eſpouſed. He loſt *Poville* and was terribly beaten by the *Serviens*, who killed forty Thouſand of his Men. *Conſtantine* dyed in 1054, and a Woman named *Theodora* ſucceeded him, who Reigned but one Year. After her came one named *Michael Stratiotique*, who Reigned alſo but one Year. *Iſaack Comnenus* diſpoſſeſſed him and took his Place, wherein he remained overwhelmed with Diſeaſes for the ſpace of two Years and ſome Months. He reſigned the Empire in the Year 1059 to *Conſtantine Ducas* a dull and mean Spirited Prince, who ſuffered the *Barbarians* to waſt Greece by their Incurſions. *Romanus Diogenes* ſucceeded him, who was taken by the *Turks* and afterwards releaſed, but being returned, his Subjects put out his Eyes, and made him dye a miſerable Death. *Michael Parapinacius* who came after him, was not more fortunate. *Nicephorus Botionatus* having Dethroned him, put him into a Monastery. *Nicephorus* having ill Reign'd was treated after the ſame manner by *Alexius Comnenus*, who took the Empire in the Year 1081: *Alexius* Reign'd thirty ſeven Years, and diſhonoured his Reign by a thouſand perfidious Actions and Wickedneſſes; The *French* beat him ſeveral times, and in fine, he dyed forſaken by all the World.

*Idem. Lib. 8. Cap. 21.* HIS Son *Fohn Comnenus* ſucceeded him, and after him *Emanuel*, a wretched and perfidious Prince who delighted to diſturb the Peace of the Church by his curious Queſtions and new Decrees, and who in fine, to crown his Life with the moſt horrible Impieties, deſigned to bring in Mahometiſm into his Empire. *Emanuel* left his Crown to his Son *Alexius*, who kept it but three Years, for he was miſerably put to Death by *Andronicus* who ſeized on the Throne as the Reward of his Crime: Yet did he not enjoy it long, for two Years after *Iſaack Angelus* ſtirred up the People againſt him, who cut him in pieces. *Alexius Angelus* a while after cauſed his Brother *Iſaac's* Eyes to be put out, and took from him the Empire. His Nephew whoſe Name alſo was *Alexius*, addreſſing himſelf to the *Latins*, they drove out the Uſurper from the Throne, and ſetled him in it, againſt whom aroſe one *Murſulphus*, and both one, and the other, having undone themſelves by their Perſidiouſneſs, the Empire fell into the Hands of the *Latins* in the Year 1204.

THE *Latins* held the Empire fifty eight Years till 1261, wherein *Michael Paleologus* took the City of *Conſtantinople* from them. Which *Michael* obtained the Empire by Murther, he cauſed the lawful Emperors Eyes to be put out (who was *Fohn Theodorus Laſcaris's* Son, being but twelve Years of Age, and ſeated himſelf in his Throne. He was both a cruel and crafty Prince, and abuſed his Subjects in a thouſand manners, being ever ready to Sacrifice the Church and Religion to his Intereſt. *Andronicus* his Son ſucceeded him, againſt whom his Grandſon named likewiſe *Andronicus* aroſe ſeveral times, and at length took from him his Crown, and reduced him to the condition of a private

private Person. His Successors were all of 'em effeminate Persons, under whom the Greek Empire retain'd not the least Shadow of its first Dignity, till such time as at length in the Year 1453, *Constantinople* was taken by the *Turks*, and every one knows how since that time the *Greeks* have lived under the Domination of those Infidels.

A Man may easily imagine *Greece* could not be long happy nor quiet under such Emperors. There were nothing but Seditions, Monopolies, Revolts, and civil Wars within, and unfortunate Wars without, sometimes against the *Saracens*, otherwhiles against the *Turks*, and *Latins*.

*Petean* the *Jesuit* discoursing of the State of this Empire under the *Paleo-* Ration. 11 m.  
*logues*, did not stick to compare it to a Sea Monster, whom the Element had Lib. 9. C. 7:  
 thrown on the Shore, deadly wounded, yet still struggling with Death; or a Poy-  
 soned Body that with much difficulty sustains it self, and crawls along, till such  
 time as the Poyson strikes into the Heart, and then it falls to the Ground and  
 gives up the Ghost.

III. IT already appears to be no wonder, if a Church amidst such dreadful Confusions and Circumstances, and overspread with such Clouds of Darkness, never exactly discussed the Difference betwixt its Doctrine and the *Latins*, but contented her self with keeping her own Belief. But consider we moreover the Influence the *Latins* had on the *Greeks*, and the manner after which they handled them, wheresoever they got the mastery. We have seen in the second Book how they drove the Greek Bishops from *Syria*, and *Palestine*, as soon as ever they settled themselves, as likewise in *Greece*. We have also observed that the Greek Emperors instead of encouraging their Patriarchs and Bishops, and upholding the Interest of their Church, have on the contrary favoured to the utmost of their Power the *Latins*, and under pretence of an Union endeavoured to subject the Greek Church to the Roman. Not that these Emperors had any kindness for the Religion of the *Latins*, but feared their Power, and therefore used all possible Compliance with the Court of *Rome*. They would not suffer its Doctrines to be ill spoken of. We have seen that in *Leo* the ninth Quarrel with *Cerularius*, *Constantin Monomaque* fail'd not to take *Leo's* Part, countenancing his Legats, and constraining *Nicetas Pectoratus* to burn his own Book, which he wrote against the *Latins*. We have likewise observ'd that *Fohn Veccus* Library keeper of the Church at *Constantinople*, saying one day in the Emperor's hearing, that altho the *Latins* were not termed Hereticks, yet they really were so. *Michael Paleologus* was thereupon so enraged, that he resolv'd to ruin him, causing him soon after to be imprison'd, and had effected his Resolution, had not *Veccus* changed his Mind. Moreover 'twas not two or three of these Emperors that were of this Temper, but almost all of 'em, as appears by what I already related in the second Book. We must then add to the second Preceding Considerations this third Remark, that the *Greeks* were forc'd to be silent for fear of the *Latins*, and their own Emperors. It may be perhaps replied, this hindred them not from Disputing on the *Procession* and *Azymes*. I grant it, but there is a great deal of Difference betwixt maintaining old Controversies, and raising new ones, which commonly beget Hatred. The *Latins* and the Emperors laboured to make them silent in the old Controversies, how then could they suffer without the greatest Punishment, there should be others begun, which would render the Design of a Reconciliation more difficult?

IV. BUT



*Pachymer. hiff.  
lib. 5. cap. 18.*

IV. BUT besides what I already mentioned, it is requisite to observe for what end the Emperors endeavoured this Reconciliation, seeing this will give us a great deal of light into the Question. *Pachymerus* relates that *Michael Paleologus* used this only Argument with his Bishops, namely, that notwithstanding the Agreement, there should be no alteration made in their Religion. Do not doubt, say's he, but after this Peace the Church shall remain in its former state; It shall not be my Fault if it does not: And again, You need not be told by me how ready our Forefathers have been to comply, as often as the publick Good required it. They considered that even God himself has not disdained to accommodate himself to our Weaknesses, in taking upon him our Flesh, and Suffering the Pains of the Cross, by which he hath purchased the Salvation of the World, so ready was he to comply with our Exigencies; no man can then blame us if from the like Intention we endeavour to avoid the Dangers that threaten us, but on the contrary we shall be the better approved of, by those that understand the nature of Affairs. And again, You must not affright the People by telling 'em, we design to proceed any farther in this Reconciliation than we ought, and as if we intended to change our ancient Customs and Ceremonies for those of the Latins, and make the same Confession of Faith as they do. Which Discourse does manifestly shew us three things. First, that there is a great deal of Difference between being silent in the Doctrine of the *Latins*, not Disputing and Charging them with Error, nay proceeding so far as a Union with them, and the Imbracing of their Doctrines; let Mr. *Arnaud* say what he pleases. For *Michael* desires but the first of these, and protests he intends not thereby to proceed to the other. The second thing that appears from the Discourse of this Emperor, is that the Principle on which I ground my Answer, and by which I pretend to overthrow Mr. *Arnaud's* Argument, is not a Proposition forged in my own Brain from the necessity of my Dispute, but a Principle not only well known by the *Greeks*, but approved and practised in an Occasion, far more important than that now in question betwixt us. For 'tis far less important to lay aside one of the Doctrines of a Church, and not Dispute on it, than to be united with her, and yet 'tis certain the Greek Church consented to this Reunion, in hope she should keep her Religion Intire, and not receive any of the Doctrines of the *Latins*. In fine, I gather from *Michael's* Discourse, and the Effect it had on the Minds of his Clergy, that the only care the *Greeks* took was to keep their own Religion, being willing to be silent, and Imbrace the Union, provided they were not forced to Imbrace the Religion of the *Latins*. If it be replied that this was indeed the Disposition of *Michael Paleologus*, but not that of his Church; I answer that *Michael* engaged 'em to consent to the Reunion upon this Regard, that each of the Churches should keep its own Opinions, and not contend and charge one another with Error. Now People are not wont to be prevailed on by Principles which they do not acknowledg to be good, and therefore plausible Pretences and fair Colours are made use to win them. Whence it follows, that the *Greeks* were far from imagining, 'twas the same thing not to dispute against the *Latins* on an Article, and to receive and own it with them. Whence it likewise follows, that if this Reason or Hope which *Michael* proposed to them was sufficient to make them do a thing in which they feared he would deceive them, (as indeed he did) a matter which was contrary to their Duty and Conscience, and against which they had moreover the greatest Aversion, it might likewise be sufficient to withhold and hinder them from doing another thing, to which they did not believe they were obliged, and from which they might refrain without the least Violence to their Inclinations.

THIS

THIS Reflection will be strengthened by considering after what sort *Veccus* the Patriarch justified himself when he became a great stickler in the Union, which he endeavoured to promote as much as in him lay. *I never deserv'd, say's he, by any thing I either thought, said, or did to disparage any of the Ceremonies or Doctrines of the Greeks, but only to establish the Peace of the Church. If any Person in imbracing this Peace has despised our Rites and Ceremonies, and preferred the Doctrines and Ceremonies of the Roman Church before them, let him be excluded the Kingdom of Heaven, and have his Portion with the Traitor Judas and his Companions, who Crucified our Saviour.* We see here this Patriarch supposes a great deal of Difference between the not Condemning the *Latins*, and letting them alone with their Doctrines; Nay so far is he from granting Mr. *Arnaud's* Consequence, that he makes this a Principle whereby to justify himself to the *Greeks*, which is a Sign that this Proposition agreed with the Genius of that Nation. For People are not wont to justify themselves by Maxims odious and publicly abhorred; if *Michael Paleologus, Veccus*, or the *Greeks* in general, have displeased Mr. *Arnaud* by this their Deportment, they are excusable: For in those Days the World was not acquainted with the Secrets of his Reasoning: The Rules of his Logick were not then published. They may henceforward become a Rule to Posterity, but he must not expect they should be more privileged than the Edicts of Princes which have no retroactive Virtue.

*Hottinger ex  
Allat in Orib.  
Grec. Pag. 65.*

V. TO convince Mr. *Arnaud* that the *Greeks* are averse to Controversies; I need only represent to him what *Anthony Eparkus* of *Corcyra* wrote to *Philip Melancthon*. For having told him how careful the *Turks* are to establish their Religion every where, and to extend the Limits of their Empire. *It would be very absurd, adds he, for us to Dispute of sublime Matters, in the Condition we are in. It behoves us to watch and apply our selves diligently to the avoiding the Danger threatening us, lest we lose our Possessions here on Earth, whilst we idly and over curiously inquire into the things of Heaven.* 'Tis certain the *Greeks* do not care to concern themselves overmuch about the things of the next Life: Their Thoughts being wholly taken up with their worldly Interest, this being the Key that opens and shuts their Mouths.

*Turco. Grec 1:  
8. Pag. 545.*

POSSEVIN the Jesuit distinguishes the *Greeks* into three Ranks, the first of People who are very Ignorant: The second, of those that having some Experience, and beholding on one hand the Majesty of the Roman Church, and on the other the Misery of the Greek one, the Pomp of the Sacrament of the *Latins*, and the Neglect wherewith the *Greeks* treat theirs, conclude that the Roman Church is better beloved by God almighty than the Greek one. The third is of those who having some knowledge of the World, are yet transported by an habitual Hatred against the *Latins*, altho their Bishops and most prudent Persons amongst them are of another Temper, and not knowing for the most part, what they say or would have; they Compare the Greek and Roman Church together, their Ceremonies with ours, and prefer their Priests to our *Latin* Priests, supposing them not so vicious as ours. Yet they dare not affirm we are in an Error, or that what we believe or practise touching the Sacrament is unwarrantable. But they affirm as to themselves, that they are in the right Way, and do not doubt of Salvation in their own Religion. Observe these two things, first that the Greek Bishops and prudentest Persons in their Church, are averse to Controversies. And secondly, that those that are not, content themselves with maintaining their own Doctrines, without condemning those of the *Latins*.

*Biblioth. select.  
de rat. ag. cum  
Grec. lib. 5.  
cap. 24.*

VI. BUT

VI. BUT it will be demanded why then did they Dispute on the Procession of the Holy Spirit, and the *Azymes*? I answer because these two Points first occasioned the Separation of the two Churches. *Photius* adhered especially to the first of these, and *Cerularius* to the latter. The reason why the *Greeks* have so earnestly stuck to these two Particulars, seems to be out of a Principle of Constancy. They have followed the first and original Causes of their Quarrel with the *Latins*, treading in the Steps of their Predecessors. Had they found the Article of the substantial Conversion in their way, they had without doubt stumbled at it, but not meeting with it, 'tis no marvel if they took no notice thereof, no more than of other Doctrines. But why was not this point at first comprehended amongst those that caused the Separation of the two Churches? The Answer is easy; because Transubstantiation was not then established in the Roman Church. *Photius* began the Separation towards the end of the ninth Century: *Cerularius* renewed it about the middle of the eleventh, and the first that determin'd the substantial Conversion was *Gregory* the VII, in the Year 1079, so that 'tis no marvel if they disputed not about it.

VII. NEITHER do I understand the *Greeks* could have just Cause to dispute this Point against the Body of the Latin Church in general, before the Council of *Constance*, that is to say, before the fifteenth Century: For altho *Gregory* the VII made his Determination in the Year 1079, as I already said, and *Innocent* the III had done the same in the Council of *Latran*, in the Year 1215, yet there were several People that did not esteem these kind of Decisions as legitimate and authentick Declarations of the Church.

*Rupert. in Fo-*  
*an. lib. 6. C. in*  
*Exod. l. 2. c. 10.*

Every body knows that *Rupert* who lived in the twelfth Century, publickly taught that the substance of Bread remains in the *Eucharist*, and becomes the Body of Christ by an hypostatical Union with the Word. *Arfelm* wrote against him, and *Algerus* disputed against his Opinion, but he was never Condemned for an Heretick. We know likewise what *Durand* of St. *Porcien* taught, who lived in the beginning of the fourteenth Century, to wit, that the Substance of Bread remains, and that losing its first form of Bread, it receives the form of the Body of Christ, in the same manner the Food we take receives the form of our Body. \* *Bellarmin* acknowledges that this Opinion, may be called a Transformation, but not a Transubstantiation. Yet was not *Durand* Prosecuted nor Condemned as an Heretick, nor his Doctrine Censured. We moreover know what was taught by *John* of *Paris* of the Order of Fryar Preachers, and Divinity Professor at *Paris*, who lived towards the end of the thirteenth Century. That altho he approved of the common Opinion touching the Conversion of the Substance of Bread into the Body of Christ, yet he durst not affirm this to be an Article of Faith, necessarily to be believed as determin'd by the Church, and that there was another more popular Opinion, and perhaps more rational and conformable to the true Doctrine of the Sacrament, namely the Assumption of the Substance of Bread by the person of the Word. We know in fine, what *Peter Dailly*, Cardinal and Bishop of *Cambray* wrote, who lived about the beginning of the fifteenth Century, namely, that it does not follow (in his Opinion) from the Churches Determination, that the Substance of Bread ceases.

\* *Bell. de Sacr.*  
*lib. 1. 3. c. 13.*  
*Thom. Wald-*  
*dens. tom. 2. de*  
*Sacr. cap. 65.*  
*Eccl. Ms. qui*  
*asseratur in*  
*Biblioth. S. V.*  
*Elor Paris. cui*  
*titul. Determi-*  
*natio fratris.*  
*Foan. de Pari-*  
*sis. predicator*  
*is de modo ex-*  
*istendi corporis*  
*Christi in Sacr.*  
*Altare &c.*  
*Intendo dicere*  
*veram existen-*  
*tiam & realem*

corporis Christi in Sacramento Altaris, & quod non est ibi solum in signo, & licet teneam & approbem illorum solemnem opinionem, quod corpus Christi est in Sacramento Altaris per conversionem substantia panis in ipsum, & quod ipsi manent accidentia sine subiecto, non tamen audeo dicere quod hoc cadet sub fide mea, sed potest aliter salvari vera, & realis existentia corporis Christi in Sacramento Altaris. Protestor tamen quod si ostenderetur dictus modus determinatus esse per Sacrum canonem, aut per Ecclesiam, aut per Concilium generale, aut per Papam, qui virtute continet totam Ecclesiam, quicquid dicam volo haberi pro non dicto, & statim paratus sum revocari, quod si non sit determinatus, contingat tamen determinari, statim paratus sum assentire. In 4. Sent. Quest. 6. Art. 4.

BUT



BUT to the end it may not be said, these are the Opinions of particular Persons who might be mistaken, I will here produce the Judgment of the Divines at *Paris* in the beginning of the fourteenth Century, that is to say, about the Year 1304, touching *Fohn* of *Paris*, and concerning the Assumption of the Substance of Bread, as is contained in a Manuscript of the Library of St. *Victor* in these Words. *The Opinion of the Faculty in Theology, in the Presence of the Masters of the Colledge, touching both the Ways whereby the Body of Christ may be said to exist on the Altar (to wit, that of the Conversion of the Substance of Bread, and that of the Assumption of this Substance by the Word) both which Opinions it holds and approves by ——— and by the Testimonies of the Fathers. Yet it says that neither of these two ways has been determined by the Church, and therefore never a one of them is an Article of Faith, and if it said otherwise, it would not have said so well, and those that express themselves otherwise, say not so well, and he that positively asserts that either one or the other of these Modes is an Article of Faith, incurs the Sentence of an Anathema.* I denote in the Margin the proper terms of the Manuscript according as they lye under this Title, *Fudicium Facultatis Theologiae.*

Titulus Fudicium facultatis Theologiae in presentia Collegij magistrorum in Theologia dictum est, utrumque videtur poni corpus Christi esse in Altari tenet pro opinione probabili & approbat utrumque per (hic est lacuna) & per dicta Sanctorum dicitur tamen quod nullus est determinatus per Ecclesiam & ideo nullum cadere sub fide. Et si aliter dixisset minus bene dixisset & qui aliter dicunt minus bene dicunt & qui determinate assereret alterutrum precise cadere sub fide incurreret sententiam Canonis Anathematis.

*FOHN* of *Paris* met with Opposition from *William* of *Orillac* Bishop of *Paris*, and several other Bishops. Yet did they not condemn his Sentiment, nor contradict what the Faculty of Theology said, but silenced him, and forbad him the Chair; Whereat he made his Appeal to *Rome*, where he came himself, and had a Committy appointed to hear him, but *Fohn* dying before his Affair was ended, the Court of *Rome* proceeded no farther in it. Mr. *Arnaud* who will needs have the *Greeks* not to be ignorant of what passed amongst the *Latins*, and supposes all *Greece* to resound with *Berengarius's* Condemnation; and Peoples *Italy* with *Greeks*, and *Greece* with *Latins*, with order to give one another account of whatsoever concerned the Doctrine of Transubstantiation, who will have the very Soldiers entertain themselves with it in the Army, as well as the Pilgrims in their Voyages; can he I say find in his Heart to tell us, that the *Greeks* knew not what such famous Authors as *Rupert*, *Durand*, *Fohn* of *Paris* and Cardinal *Dailly* publicly maintained in the twelfth, thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth Century, that they knew not what passed in one of the chief Cities in the *West*, and in a Faculty so illustrious as that of *Paris*, that they knew not an Affair that was carried to *Rome*, and touching which that Court made no Decision? In truth if they knew nothing of this, and that neither the Pilgrims, nor Ambassadors, nor Soldiers, nor Inquisitors, nor the *Greeks* in *Italy*, nor the *Latins* in *Constantinople*, gave them no Notice thereof, they may have been ignorant as well of other things, and Mr. *Arnaud's* Assurance signifies nothing, that their Curiosity made them search into all things. For altho that in some of these Centuries there were no more Croisado's into the *Holy Land*, nor *Latins* that held the Greek Empire; yet the Commerce between the *Greeks* and *Latins* was frequent, and both one and thother were often together in *Italy*, and several other places; and it was a very easy matter to send Notice to the *Greeks* of what passed in the *West*, concerning these Doctors. Should Mr. *Arnaud* say they knew this, he must not take it ill, if they made this a Reason for their Silence and Reservedness; For why should they accuse a Church wherein it is permitted to affirm, that the Substance of Bread remains, wherein it is affirmed that there is nothing to be positively asserted concerning the Subject of Transubstantiation, and Appeals made to *Rome* it self thereupon, and yet this Court does not so much as declare the contrary.

VIII. SUPPOSING the *Greeks* believed Transubstantiation, how came it to pass they were not scandaliz'd at the boldness of all these Authors? Why would they not satisfy themselves in so considerable a Point as that which these Authors handled, namely that the Church had not yet determin'd any thing touching the Conversion of the Substance of Bread? Why did they not reprove the *Latins* for this, and especially the Roman Church for being silent in a Particular wherein her Belief and Practice were concern'd. Let Mr. *Arnaud* give us a Reason for this Reservedness of the *Greeks*, who makes them such great Disputers? And let him also shew us a Reason for the Church of *Rome's* Silence? That the Doctrine of Transubstantiation is not an Article of Faith, and that the Church has not yet determin'd it so to be, we find *John of Paris* ready to justify within the Walls of *Rome* it self, and yet she takes no notice of it. She suffers a Person to dye in this Error, neither Condemns his Opinion, nor Memory, and that which is moreover worse, is, that she leaves the whole World in suspense about a Point wherein the Faith of all her Children are concern'd. For if a man doubts whether the Conversion of Substances be a Point of Faith, he cannot believe it as a Point of Faith. And if a man cannot believe it as a Point of Faith, how will he be persuaded of the Truth of it? And if it must be held only as a probable Opinion of Learned men, what will become of it when we shall find it so improbable, and so little agreeable to right Reason? Yet does not the Church of *Rome* mention a Word of this, but lets the Question ly Dormant, so that should we argue from her Silence, as Mr. *Arnaud* does from that of the *Greeks*, we might conclude she approves *John of Paris* his Opinion, seeing she does not condemn it. Yet will I not go so far; It suffices me that the Church of *Rome* has not condemned the Proposition in Question. This is enough to hinder the *Greeks* from Reproaching the Latin Church with Transubstantiation.

THIS Affair of *John of Paris*, together with the Judgment of the Faculty in Theology, and Silence of the Roman Church, is of such Importance, that this alone is sufficient to decide the Question, and manifest to Mr. *Arnaud* that the Doctrine of Transubstantiation has not been perpetual in the Church. For that a Faculty so considerable as is that of *Paris* should assure us this manner of the Existence of Christ's Body in the Eucharist, is not determined by the Church, nor is an Article of Faith, and whosoever shall assert that it is so, ought to be Anathematiz'd. That the Affair having been carried to *Rome*, and that Court be silent therein, and determine nothing about it; I say this is enough to refute this pretended Perpetuity, which Mr. *Arnaud* has taken upon him to defend.

BUT return we to the *Greeks*. We may add to what I already mentioned this considerable Remark, which is, that the *Latins* never raised a Dispute with the *Greeks* about the general Expressions which these last make use of touching the *Eucharist*.

BUT before we carry on this Consideration any farther, it is necessary that I put the Reader again in mind, that the Question is not to know whether the *Greeks* have the same Opinion with us touching the *Eucharist*, much less whether they explain themselves after the same manner. This is Mr. *Arnaud's* perpetual Illusion, to suppose we make them *Berengarians*; and 'tis on this wrong Ground whereon he builds his whole Discourse. We scarcely meet with any other but these kind of Arguings in his Dispute, viz. Whether

ther the *Greeks* were *Berengarians*? Whether they Believed the Bread in the Sacrament to be only a Figure? Whether they understood our Saviour's Words in the Sence of *Significat, &c.* To the end then the Reader may not be deceived, I do here again acknowledg that the *Greeks* believe a great deal more touching the *Eucharist* than we do, that they exprefs themselves otherwise about it, and follow neither the Sentiments nor Expressions of *Berengarius*. Neither have we given Mr. *Arnaud* any Occasion to assert what he does. We only affirm'd they do not believe the Transubstantiation of the Roman Church, nor worshipped the Sacrament with a sovereign Adoration; and 'tis upon this Mr. *Arnaud* ought to argue to deal sincerely.

AND therefore I say the *Latins* never disputed with the *Greeks* touching their Expressions, how general soever they have been; They have indeed done what they could whereby to introduce insensibly amongst them the Terms of *μετεμορφωσις*, and of *μεταβολὴ τῆς οὐσίας*, *Transubstantiation*, *change of Substance*. They have for this purpose made use of their Profelytes, and Scholars of the Seminaries, to whom they have given the Confession of Faith which we observed in the preceding Book, in which those Terms are found. They have set 'em down in Latin in the Acts of the Reunion. But in the Greek of these same Acts, they have contented themselves with the general Expressions of *τελείωσις*, *ἀγίασμος*, *μεταβολὴ*, as we have already seen. They have not quarrelled with them about 'em, for Reasons not hard to be understood, and which we shall see hereafter, and when the Profelytes and Scholars of the Seminaries found their Terms were not receiv'd, they became angry thereat, but on the contrary accomodated themselves to others. We cannot then wonder if this Conduct has kept the *Greeks* from discussing any farther the Differences which separate the two Churches. They agreed in the general Expressions, that the Bread is made the Body of Jesus Christ, that 'tis changed into his Body, and the *Latins* required no more.

THE Snare lay hid under this Compliance, and this Conduct kept off the *Greeks* from all Inquiries. For, for to find the Difference there is between the Doctrine of the *Greeks*, and that of the *Latins*, and make a right Judgment thereon, we must not lightly and superficially examine them, seeing they require an application of Mind and Study. We must read Latin Authors, compare them with the Doctrine of the Ancients, and with that of the Greek Church, and not suffer our selves to be surprized with false appearances, but consider the two Doctrines themselves, and especially their Consequences, to find wherein they differ; For at first Sight the Difference seems not great. They explain themselves sometimes in the like manner, but their Consequences infinitely differ, as has been observed in the last Chapter of the preceding Book. Now how few amongst the *Greeks* have been able to go thro with this Discussion; and of those that were capable, how few were in a condition to make a right Judgment? We have seen what *Bozins* said of 'em from the Relation of one *Gregory*, that under the Empire of *Andronicus*, (he means I suppose *Andronicus* the younger, in whose Reign the Reunion of the Churches was again proposed) *there was no Person to be found in all Greece, that was able to Dispute with the Latins about Religious Matters.* Can it seem strange, that People (who could not maintain their ancient Controversies, so greatly insisted on by their Fathers, and which are as it were hereditary to them,) should neglect to discuss those new Doctrines I speak of, and content themselves with keeping their own Belief, without concerning themselves with that of Strangers?



X. MOREOVER we must consider that the *Greeks* have ever referred to almighty God, the knowledg of the Change hap'ning in the *Eucharist*, without offering to determine it. This appears as well by their general Terms, as by what I already related, concerning the Confession of *Metrophannus* the Patriarch of *Alexandria*, and the profession of Faith compiled for the Sarra-cen Profelytes, from the Prayer in their *Euchology*, the Judgment which *Nicetas* made on the Conduct of the Patriarch *Camaterus*, and the Dispute of *Fohn* the Patriarch of *Ferusalem*. When then they hear the *Latins* who determine the manner of this Change, saying 'tis a real Conversion of the Substance of Bread and Wine; we must not find it strange, if they contain themselves in their generalities, and neither Receive nor Condemn this Doctrine. Whether they do well or ill in this, I shall not here determine: But howsoever, 'tis in no wise strange that People of that Temper the *Greeks* are of, should thus deport themselves. I have already observed elsewhere that he that shewed himself most forward amongst them, was the Patriarch *Cyrrillus*; for he proceeded so far as to a positive Rejection of Transubstantiation, and yet he rejected it only under the Title of *Rash*, ἐπευθεῖσθαι, say's he, εἰς αὐτοῦ μὴ οὐκ ἔστιν, *Transubstantiation rashly invented*.

ALL which things being considered, let any Man judg whether what I say (concerning the *Greeks* not expressly opposing the Doctrine of the Conversion of Substances, altho they did not believe it) be not grounded on all imaginable Probability, and whether on the contrary Mr. *Arnaud's* Consequence, how surprizing soever it may seem at first, is not in effect void of all kind of Probability. They have lived time out of mind in most stupid Ignorance; They have been overwhelmed in Confusions, and oppressed with domestick Misfortunes: They have been continually urged by their Emperors to comply with the *Latins*, that they might thereby avoid their Displeasure, and procure their Favour; They have been perfwaded that this Compliance will bring no Prejudice to their Religion. They are moreover a People that were ever noted to be naturally more than others fixt to their temporal Interests, preferring the Preservation of their Estates, before their Religion. They are not ignorant how the Roman Church resents it, when accused of Error, as appears by the Complaint of *Cyrrillus*, who speaking of the *Latins*, say's that they obstinately defend whatsoever they do, right or wrong, let their Errors be made never so apparent. That they maintain they can neither Err in Belief nor Practice, and that which is yet worse, they fly in the Faces of those that Christianly admonish them, and shew them their Errors. That they persecute such with Fire and Sword, as if it were not lawful to repel the Injury they do to Christianity, and to guard and defend our selves against the Evil. It appears in their ordinary Conversation, how reserved and fearful they are of offending the *Latins*. The Question of Transubstantiation is not to be found amongst their primitive and original Disputes. They might likewise reasonably doubt whether the Roman Church determin'd it before the Council of *Constance*. The *Latins* have not disputed with them about it, but accommodated themselves to the form of their Expressions. It is no easy matter for them to penetrate as far as the real Differences which distinguish the Doctrines of the two Churches. And in fine, one of their Maxims is, that they may very well leave the Knowledg of the Change which happens in the *Eucharist*, unto God, without troubling themselves any farther about it. Is it not nearer to Truth to say as I do, that it does not follow these People believed Transubstantiation, altho they have not made thereof a Point of Controversy, and kept themselves in a kind of

Epist. Cyrrill.  
ad Wittemb. in  
Epist. Vxor.  
crud.

Medium,

*Medium*, neither Believing it, nor Condemning it; than to say as Mr. *Arnaud* does, that if they have not opposed it, nor disputed on it, nor reproached the Roman Church with it as an Error, it inevitably follows, they have, and do still believe it.

## CHAP. VI.

*A farther Examination of Mr. Arnaud's Negative Arguments. A particular Reflection concerning what pass in the Treaties of Reunion, and especially in the Council of Florence, and afterwards.*

THE more we consider the Principles on which Mr. *Arnaud* Reasons, the plainlier appears the Nullity of the Consequence he pretends to draw thence. He say's for Example that *Theophylact*, reduces all the Differences which separated in his time the two Churches Lib. 2. c. 94  
p. 174. to the single addition of the Filioq; in the Symbol. So that if this Principle be true, the Greeks and Latins agreed in all other things but this one of the Filioq;. He say's that *Basil* the Archbishop of *Thessalonica*, writing to Pope *Adrian* the IV, Protests to him that the Greeks differ not from the Latin Church. If this be true, *Theophylact* has deceived us, when he tells us they differ in the Filioq;. He tells us that the sharpness of *Balsamon*, who was very much against the Church of Rome, would not suffer him to dissemble this Accusation, (to wit, to believe Transubstantiation) which would be the most specious of all others, and the most proper to alienate the Affections of the Greeks, and hinder their Reconciliation with the Latins. But if we must refer our selves in all particulars to *Balsamon's* Silence, in how many Points shall we establish Peace, wherein there was a real Division? He tells us *Eutymius* wrote a Book against the Latins, in which he only treats of the Procession of the Holy Spirit, that Lib. 2. c. 11.  
p. 204. *Chrysolanus* the Archbishop of *Milain* reduced to this single Article, all whatsoever he upbraided the Greeks with; that *John Phurnius* wrote against *Chrysolanus*, and mentions only the Procession; and that this same *Phurnius* Ibid. p. 205. disputed against another Archbishop of *Milain* named *Peter*, on this Article Ibid. p. 204. alone. But if Mr. *Arnaud* goes on after this rate, what will become of the Controversy touching the *Azyme*. He tells us that *Nicolas Methoniensis* answers *Chrysolanus*, and that he wrote another Treatise concerning the *Azymes*, that *Eustratius* Bishop of *Nice*, *Theodorus Prodromus*, *Nicetas Seidus*, and several other Authors of the twelfth Century that wrote against the Latins, applied themselves only to the Controversies touching the Holy Spirit, and the *Azymes*. He makes an exact Computation of all the Greeks of the fourteenth Century, that wrote against the Roman Church, and assures us they Lib. 3. c. 7. all of 'em restrained themselves to these two Points. He farther shews us Lib. 3. c. 2. that in the Treaty of Agreement, which was begun in the Year 1232, between *Gregory* the IX, and *German* the Patriarch of *Constantinople*, there Lib. 3. c. 4. were no more mentioned than these two Questions; and that the Patriarch *Veccus* having been condemned under *Andronicus*, for favouring the Latins, his whole charge consisted only of the Procession of the Holy Spirit. So that if

if we stop here, we may restrain the differences of the two Churches to these two Articles, and establish an intire Conformity in all the rest.

AS fast as Mr. *Arnaud* produces each of these things in particular, he fails not to conclude that the *Greeks* and *Latins* had but one and the same Faith touching Transubstantiation. But how happens it he has not seen, that if his Consequence be good, it may be likewise concluded they have the same Opinion touching other Articles, wherein yet is found a manifest Difference? His Proofs have this Property, that if we take each of 'em in particular, they overthrow one another. For if the *Greeks* and *Latins* taught only, one and the same thing, why are they made to dispute touching the Procession of the Holy Spirit. If all their Differences may be reduced to the Article of the Holy Spirit, why do they dispute on the *Azymes*? If they be divided only in these two Points, wherefore in the Council of *Florence* was there mentioned the Doctrine of Purgatory, the beatifical Vision of the Saints, and primacy of the See of *Rome*? What certainty is there in all these negative Arguments, seeing that each of 'em in particular overthrow one another?

HE will tell us we must take them all together, and conclude from thence in general that the *Greeks* and *Latins* are not at all at Variance touching Transubstantiation, seeing that in all their Disputes agitated since so long a time, by so many several Authors, and so many several Occasions, we do not find any Contest touching this Point. I answer, we have taken them thus in the preceding Chapter, and found they conclude no better in general than in particular. I consent they be taken in any sort; for if they be examined each of 'em apart, their weaknesses will soon be discovered, being contradictory to one another, and if joyned together, they can produce no greater effect by their Union,\* than to persuade us the *Greeks* never made Transubstantiation a Point of Controversy with the *Latins*. But this is no more than what we already granted to Mr. *Arnaud*. But that it follows hence the two Churches held this for an Article of both their Faiths: This we deny, and have given our Reasons why we do so.

BUT the more to facilitate the Judgment which ought to be made of these things, it will not be amiss to examine some particular Circumstances, by which Mr. *Arnaud* has pretended to give Colour to his Argument. He tells us then, first, that the *Greeks* have been often together with the *Latins* in Councils, and yet there was never any mention made of Transubstantiation therein: That they were together at the Synod of *Barris* where *Anselm* disputed against 'em: That the Abbot *Nectarius* was an assessor at the Council of *Latran* under *Alexander* the III. That the Emperor *Emanuel* assembled a Council at *Constantinople* in order to a Reunion, wherein the two Parties failed not to appear: That there was one held at *Nice* upon the same Occasion: That *Michael Paleologus* called several Assemblies in *Greece* for the same purpose: That he sent his Legats and Deputies from the Greek Church to the Council at *Lyons*, in which the Reunion was concluded, and that in fine, they met together in the Council of *Florence*.

I answer, there was never any Council held, either in the *East* or *West*, by the *Greeks* alone, or *Latins*, nor by *Greeks* and *Latins* both together, wherein all the Differences of the two Churches were proposed to be examined. There were never any Points handled in them, but those which were ever openly and expressly controverted, and even not all of them neither. In the Synod of

Lib. 2. c. 2.  
p. 171.

Lib. 2. c. 11.  
p. 210.  
Ibid.

Lib. 3. c. 2.  
p. 263.

Lib. 3. c. 3.  
Ibid.

Lib. 4. c. 2.



of *Barry*, there was only handled the Point of the Procession of the Holy Ghost. Does this argue they agreed in all the rest? *There was not*, say's Mr. *Arnaud*, any other Difference in the Doctrines of Faith. But what matter is it whether the other Differences were concerning Articles of Faith, seeing the *Greeks* made them the occasion of their Separation, and stuck to 'em with all possible earnestness? Moreover, who told Mr. *Arnaud* that the *Greeks* esteem not the Article of the *Azymes* as a Point of Faith, and likewise those of Purgatory, and the Pope's Supremacy, &c? Neither the *Greeks* nor the *Latins*, say's Mr. *Arnaud*, supposed there were any other Differences between them in Points of Faith, than that touching the Procession of the Holy Ghost. Yet did they not agree in their Opinions about Purgatory, nor the Pope's Supremacy, and yet according to Mr. *Arnaud* the *Latins* of those times reckoned not these Doctrines amongst the Articles of their Faith. Sure I am there are People of his own Communion who will not justify him in this Assertion.

'TIS the same in reference to the Council of *Lateran*. He is willing to make use of it, because he finds it amongst his Collections, but it will be a hard matter for him to shew what pass therein touching the *Greeks*, for all that he can know of it, is contained in the Letters of *George* Bishop of *Corcyra* to the Abbot *Nestairus*, and from the Abbot's Letters again to *George*, mentioned by *Baronius*, and which relate not a Word to the purpose. Baron. ad  
ann. 1179.

TO refute what he tells us concerning the Council of *Constantinople* under *Emanuel Comnenus*, I need only mention what he himself relates. That the *Latins* require no more of the *Greeks*, than that they should mention the Pope's Name in their publick Offices, acknowledge his Supremacy, and rights of Appeals. Which is as much as to say, that all the rest signified nothing, provided the Pope be satisfied. Lib. 2. c. 11,  
p. 210.

AT *Nice* were only examined the Procession of the Holy Spirit, and the *Azymes*, other Differences were laid aside. And as to what passed under *Michael Paleologus* touching the Reunion of the two Churches, Mr. *Arnaud* forgets to put us in mind of that Violence, Deceit, and Tyranny which that Emperor used to accomplish his Design, as we already observed, which was managed by Cruelty, Imprisonments, Punishments, and Banishments, and which drew on *Michael* such a deadly Hatred from the *Greeks*, that they refused him Burial after his Death; an Affair wherein after all he cheated the *Greeks*, in making them believe that each Church should keep its Doctrines and Ceremonies, and that it signified nothing to amuse the Pope with granting him his Supremacy, right of Appeals, and commemoration of him in their Liturgy.

AS to what concern'd the Council of *Florence*, the Author of the *Perpetuity* having already made use of it, I believ'd 'twas sufficient to answer him that whatsoever passed in it, was a meere politick Intrigue, as well in respect of the *Latins*, as the *Greeks*, that Pope *Eugenius* and his Court acted therein with Violence, and the Greek Emperor managed his Business after a very timorous and interessed manner, and the Greek Bishops bewrayed a most pittiful Ignorance and Weakness, several of 'em being won by the *Latins*, the rest signing the Act of Reunion without any Consultation held first together, whence I conclude there must not be advantage taken hence, as if the *Greeks* and *Latins* were agreed in the Point of the substantial Conversion Answ. to the  
2d. Treatise.  
2. p. 6. 8.

version under pretence it was not debated in that Council, and that the rather because the *Greeks* upon their return into their own Country openly renounced this pretended Reunion.

Lib. 4. c. 2.  
P. 333.

BE my Answers never so reasonable, yet do they not relish well with Mr. *Arnaud*, wherefore it must not be expected he was satisfied with this. Much less inquire whether 'twas with or without a Preface, that he offered his new Objections; For 'twould be a kind of Miracle if he who reproaches me with my Prefaces, should so much as once enter upon Examination of a thing, without preparing the Readers by long Discourses. Mr. Claude, say's he, here, *who can speak when he pleases, Court Language in his Books of Divinity, pleasantly reproaches in the Preface of his Book the Author of the Perpetuity, that he decides Questions like a Soldier. I examine not at present whether he had Reason for his application of this Expression, I reserve this for the Discourse wherein I design to treat of his personal Differences with this Author. But seeing he has introduced this term in a serious Dispute: I think I may borrow it of him, whereby to express after what sort he gets clear of some considerable Difficulties, and touching which we may say with great reason, that never Man fought his way thro them more Soldier like than he did. And a little further; I cannot produce a better Instance of Mr. Claude's Soldier like Humour, than the manner in which he treats of whatsoever passed in the Council of Florence.*

IT sufficiently appears Mr. *Arnaud* design'd to censure the use I made of the Term of Soldier-like, and the Author of the *Perpetuity* likewise Criticiz'd on another of my Expressions, viz. *Fly in a mans Face*. But if I may speak my Thoughts of these Censures: It seems to me these kind of dealings become not Persons, that profess a more profound Literature, and consequently should mind things, more than Words, not to say these Remarks are far Remote from the Subject we handle, and contribute little to the clearing up of our Question. Moreover what have we to do with the Court, and its Language in our Dispute. I pretend not to speak the Language of the Court, my Condition and Profession keeps me at such a Distance from it, that I know not what Language is spoke there. I do not question but they express themselves politely and rationally, but passing my Life as I do out of the Palaces of great Personages, and far from the Honour of their Commerce, their ways of Expressing themselves are unknown to me. I am not perhaps sufficiently in Love with the Age I live in, to leave my common Expressions, to accommodate my self to that of the Court. In short, I pretend not to speak so neatly, as to suppose my Style is without Fault. I leave to others the Glory of becoming Masters of Language; to discredit received Expressions, and introduce new ones, whether justly or not, I refer my self to others to judge, that understand them. In the meantime methinks Mr. *Arnaud* should not so greatly find fault with this Term of *Soldier-like*, considering the use I made of it. *I believed, said I, I ought much less to make use of this new Method which that Author has found out whereby to refute Mr. Aubertin's Book, and in effect this is to do like Alexander, who cut the knot he could not untie, and to Dispute Soldier like.* This Term thus used in a Preface seemed supportable: Yet I am sorry it has offended Mr. *Arnaud*, if it be because we made his Friend a common Soldier, let him consider likewise, we represented him also as an *Alexander*.

BUT howsoever let's see whether my Answer concerning the Council of *Florence*, is so Soldier like as he pretends. *Policy, say's he, has its Bounds,*  
it

it has not a part in every Affair, nor effects all things: Who doubts it? All that I attribute to the Effects of that Policy which reigned so much in that Council, was, that it obliged the *Greeks* to Reunite themselves with the *Latins*, without a Pre examination of all the Differences between the two Churches, in hope each of 'em should keep their own Doctrines, and suffer no Innovations. This was the same Policy *Michael Paleologus* inspired his Bishops with, as we already observed, and made them consent to the Union at the Council of *Lyons*, under *Gregory* the X. Now this is called in my *Dictionary*, (for Mr. *Arnaud* tells me too of *Dictionaries* of my own making) this is called, I say, a plastered Union, an external Agreement which has no more than the Shadow and appearance of a Union, seeing that within there is a real Separation.

THE Judgment which ought to be made of my Answer, depends on two Questions, the first, whether in effect Policy had any share in this Affair, or not: the second, whether we may justly say that it so far prevail'd on the *Greeks* as to make 'em silent in the Point of Transubstantiation, altho they did not believe it.

FOR the deciding of the first Question, I desire no other Person than Mr. *Arnaud* himself, 'tis no great Mystery, say's he, to tell us that in this Design of an Union, touching the Differences which divided the *Greeks* from the *Latins*, there should be politick Respects, and humane Interests; this is neither marvelous nor unjust. But whether Just, or Unjust, is not the Question, it is sufficient to me there were such Respects in this Affair. The *Turks*, say's he likewise, made great Progresses, and reduced the Emperor to the greatest Extremity. And a little lower, The Emperor chose rather to treat with the Pope and Cardinals, as being more able to procure him that Assistance, he needed and hoped to obtain by means of the Union, than with the Council of Bale. Here then we have the Policy and Interest of the *Greeks* described. The Fathers of Bale, say's he moreover, were very desirous to raise up the Dignity of their Council, by an Union with the *Greeks*, and therefore they made the most advantageous Offers they were able, to the Deputies of the Emperor John Paleologus Emanuel's Son and Successor. But *Eugenus* the IV intending to transfer the Council from Bale to Ferrara, he made use of the Reunion of the *Greeks* for a Pretence of this Translation, and so ordered it with the Greek Emperor, that he engaged him to send word he could not come to Bale. So that here we have again the political Interest of *Eugenus* and his Bishops. We might here relate several matters touching the miserable State of the *Greeks*, and of the Negotiations of the Council of Bale, and of Pope *Eugenus* with the Emperor and Patriarch, touching the Reasons why the Pope was preferred, and several other Circumstances. But it is needless to prove a Point that is granted.

COME we then to the second Question, whether it may be truly said that Policy so far prevail'd on the *Greeks* as to make 'em silent on the Doctrine of Transubstantiation, altho they did not believe it. For the clearing up of this Point, the Reader must here remember what I proved in the foregoing Chapter. 1. That there are two sorts of different Opinions between the *Greeks* and *Latins*, some of which broke out into open Disputes, and others not. 2. That altho the Doctrines of the two Churches touching the Change hap'ning in the *Eucharist*, are in the main infinitely different, yet is their Difference concealed under a Vail of Expressions common to 'em both. On these two Principles I say we must not imagine there was made in this Coun-



Syrop. Hist.  
Concil. Flor.  
S. E. 3. c. 6.

cil a general Discussion of all the Points wherein these two Churches differ'd, nor that the Union was carried on upon this Account. It was indeed at first the Sentiment of *George Scholarius* who told the Emperor, *that to make a solid and lasting Union, it was needful to examine all the Doctrines on both sides, without omitting any.* But for the making of a politick temporary Union, the sending of three or four Deputies was sufficient, which would produce the same, if not a better Effect, and would be more beneficial to their Country, than if the Emperor and his whole Clergy were present. This Advice was presently liked of, but not taken. For there was neither mention in the Council of Christ's descent into Hell, the Salvation of the Damned, Apocryphal Books, nor of any other Points but what had been openly controverted, and of them how many were pass'd over in Silence? There was no mention of the Communion in both kind, altho the *Greeks* hold the necessity thereof, nor of the Priests Celibacy, altho this had been formerly debated, nor use of carved Images, which the *Greeks* esteem Idols, nor Ministry of Confirmation, which the *Latins* hold belongs only to the Bishop, whereas the *Greeks* administer it by their Priests, altho *Photius* made it a Cause of Separation. Neither was there any mention of the use of Blood, and Creatures strangled, which the *Greeks* held unlawful, altho *Cerularius* made it his chief Accusation, nor of the visible Light which shined about the Body of our Saviour on Mount *Tabor*, which the *Greeks* hold to be a Beam of God's eternal Light, nor several other Errors broached by *Palamas* which the *Greeks* have embraced, nor of the Pope's Power to grant Indulgencies, which the *Greeks* deride, nor of the three Immersions they believe necessary in Baptism. There was only mention of the Procession of the Holy Ghost, the *Azymes*, Purgatory; the beatifical Vision of the Saints, and papal Supremacy. And yet there were but two of these five Points discuss'd neither, namely that of Purgatory, and that of the Holy Spirit; the others pass'd into the Decree without Examination, as appears by the Acts of the same Council. And now would Mr. *Arnaud* make us believe that Policy could not so far prevail on the *Greeks*, as to make 'em silent in the Point of Transubstantiation? It made 'em silent in Points expressly set down in their Books, in others which were publickly controverted betwixt them and the *Latins*, and agitated in the time of their Separation, and yet it could not shut their Mouths, in Reference to an Article on which they saw nothing determin'd in their Church, neither for it, nor against it, on which neither they nor their Fathers had yet Disputed, and of whose Importance they could not judg, being hindred by their Ignorance.

MOREOVER, had Transubstantiation been propos'd to have been either approved or rejected, Mr. *Arnaud's* Argument would have some Colour perhaps. I say perhaps, for after all, if their Policy was so prevalent as to make 'em sign a Decree against their own Consciences; wherein they renounced their ancient Opinions touching the five Articles, and received those of the *Latins*; who sees not that it might as well obliged 'em to receive the Doctrine of the substantial Conversion? But howsoever they were not put upon to acknowledg it, and their Silence signifies no more on either part, but that both were quietly permitted to enjoy their own Opinions. We must not imagine they pretended to approve by Virtue of this Union all the Doctrines of the *Latins*, and there could be no more concluded thence at farthest, than a simple Toleration, as of other Points which were not discuss'd; Now if humane Interest was so powerful over the *Greeks* as to make 'em abjure their own Opinions, and embrace in appearance others, can it be thought strange they should pass over in Silence an Article of that kind. It seems

seems on the contrary that Zeal for their Religion, if they had any spark of it yet left, should oblige 'em to restrain the Dispute to a few Points, for they would lose as many of 'em as they proposed. The necessity of their Affairs forced them to make a Sacrifice of 'em to the *Latins*, so that all those they could smother by their Silence, were as so many Points won, because they were not lost.

MR. Arnaud tells us, that their politick Interests were not so prevalent over *Lib. 4. c. 2.* 'em, as to take away from 'em all kind of Liberty, and carry them forth to the *P. 337.* betraying of their own Judgments without resistance; that on the contrary they managed their Pretensions, and that the Question touching the Holy Spirit was discussed in this Council, with as much exactness as ever any was in any Council. That if they betrayed their Conscience, it was thro humane Weakness, having first rendered to their Opinions all the Testimonies which could be expected from weak Persons: But what could be alledged to less purpose? All this is true in respect of the Doctrines which they were forced to abandon, to subscribe to contrary ones; but this signifies nothing to others they mention not, and which consequently they were not obliged to receive, amongst which that of Transubstantiation was one, and moreover this Resistance and Management he speaks of, only appeared in the Doctrine of the *Procession*, and not in other Points contained in the Decree, for they passed them over without Examination and Discussion, except that of Purgatory, which was slightly regarded:

MR. Arnaud sets himself to show afterwards that the *Latins* did not suspect the *Greeks* held not Transubstantiation; that they betrayed not their own Sentiments, nor were wilfully ignorant of those of the *Greeks*. We shall hereafter consider the Conduct of the *Latins*; But make we first an end of examining that of the *Greeks*. Does Mr. Claude, say's he, know what he say's when he makes such unreasonable Suppositions? Does he consider into what absurdities he plunges himself. Or will he pretend the *Greeks* agreed amongst themselves before they parted from Constantinople, to conceal their Opinions on this Point from the *Latins*, and carried on this Design so dexterously, that amongst so many *Greeks* there were not one of them that discovered this Secret to the *Latins*? There are certainly judicious Persons enough still in the World to determine which of us two seems to consider most what he say's. I do not pretend that either the *Greeks* plotted together at Constantinople, or that they carried it so closely at Florence, but that the *Latins* might know (if they would) what was their Belief touching the *Eucharist*; Their Books speak their Minds. These Complots and Conspirations are Phantasms which appear to Mr. Arnaud in the heat of his Study. I pretend no more than what is true, to wit, that the *Greeks* passed over in Silence several Articles on which they had not the same Sentiments as the *Latins*, and I believe Transubstantiation was one of them. If Mr. Arnaud pretends the contrary, it lies upon him to produce his Reasons. Let him tell us what Complot there could be between the *Greeks* and *Latins*, in reference to their Silence in so many other Points, which were not discussed. Let him tell us at least why in the Acts of the Council, and other Writings, wherein is mentioned the *Eucharist*, when the *Latins* say, *Transubstantiate*, the *Greeks* on the contrary say only *Consecrate* and *Sanctify*. Wherefore in the Decretal of the Union, whether we read it in Latin or Greek, we find no mention there of the substantial Conversion. Why the Article of the Sacrament was expressed in these general Terms, *Corpus Christi veraciter confici*, τὸ τῶ χριστοῦ σῶμα πλεῖσται ἀληθῶς. Was it Policy or Ignorance;

*Ignorance, or Complot, or Conspiracy* which made them reject the Terms of Gregory the VII. *The Bread and Wine are changed substantially into the true, proper and living Flesh, &c.* or those of Innocent the III. *The Bread is transubstantiated into the Body, and the Blood into the Wine?* For, for to tell us that the Greeks meant by their *τελειῶσαι*, a true and real Transubstantiation, because 'twas thus the *Latins* understood their *Confici*, is a frivolous Pretence which I have already refuted.

Concil. Flor.  
Sess. 23.

Sess. 25.

Sess. 25:

MR. *Arnaud* takes a great deal of Pains to prove the *Latins* could not be Ignorant of the Sentiment of the *Greeks*, nor the *Greeks* of the *Latins*; But to no purpose. It signifies nothing to me whether they did, or did not know one anothers Opinions. We will suppose if he will, they made this their particular Study, but then what signifies this to our Question? I am satisfi'd they were reunited without any formal Declaration of their Agreement in this Point, for as it cannot be concluded from their Silence on other Points, that there were no difference betwixt them, so is it the same concerning Transubstantiation. Mr. *Arnaud* reasons ill, because he argues from this Principle, that the *Greeks* disputed on all Particulars wherein they knew they differed from the *Latins*. This is a false Principle, as appears by the Instances I already produced. It appears from the very Acts of that Council that the Emperor wearied with the Debate, hastned to Expedients whereby to conclude the Union. *We have left, (say's he to his Greeks) our Families in danger, exposed to the Fury of the Infidels. Time slips away, and we advance nothing, let us lay aside these Disputes, and betake our selves to some Medium. And therefore we find the Greeks telling the Latins: That they were not for Disputing, because Disputes generally ingendred Trouble. But they should endeavour to find out some other means of Union. We have already told you, say's the Emperor to Cardinal Julian, that we are not for any more Disputes, for Words are never wanting to you. Your Dialect will never suffer you to acquiesce in any thing, being ever ready at a Reply, and to speak the last. Let us I pray then lay aside these tedious Controversies, and betake our selves to some other means for reuniting us.*

Lib. 4. c. 2.  
p. 343.

Hist. Conc. Flor.  
Sess. 10. cap. 9.

Sess. 10. c. 10.

BUT the *Greeks* assisted at the Service of the *Latins*, and adored the *Mafs* in the same manner as the *Roman Church*, say's *Andrew de St. Cruce*. I answer they were present at the Service of the *Latins*, not to show they approved their Doctrine touching the Conversion, but only in token of their Union, each Church keeping its own particular Belief. Who will wonder if People who could against their Consciences sign a Decree wherein they expressly abjured five of the Articles of their Faith, whereby to reconcile themselves with the Church of *Rome*, should yield to be once present at its Service? Yet this was not without offering Violence to themselves, for *Syropulus* observes, that the Pope having sent them word that on the morrow they must celebrate *Mafs*, and consummate the Union, and that if there were any amongst them would partake of the Mysteries of the *Latins*, they should prepare themselves; at these Words the *Greeks* were seized with Horror, *ἡμῶν ἀποθνήσκοντες ἐξεπλάγμην.* Moreover I know not whether what *Andrew de St. Cruce* says be true, that they adored the *Mafs* in the same manner as the *Latins*, for the same *Syropulus* relates that they stood all the time of the Office; *We stood*, say's he, in our Vestments during the Liturgy. But supposing it were true they used the same external Ceremonies as the *Latins*, it would not hence follow they believed the Doctrine of Transubstantiation, nor gave the *Eucharist* a sovereign Adoration. For to kneel before an Object is not in the Sence of either *Greeks* or *Latins*, a token that a Man adores it; neither with an absolute Adoration, nor that of *Latria*.



I am so far from excusing this Action, that I believe it is on the contrary inexcusable both before God and Men ; But how great soever their Fault was in assisting at the Service of the *Latins*, which they so greatly abhorred, it appears that what they did, was not to testify they believed the same things as they, but that the Union after a sort was accomplished. For they were present at their Service, only in hope the *Latins* would likewise assist at theirs, and in effect the Emperor was very urgent with the Pope for this. To which the Pope replied, he would first examine their Liturgy, and particularly consider in what manner they celebrated it, and see whether he could satisfy their Demands. Whereupon the Emperor finding himself abused, thus expressed himself. *We hoped the Latins would have amended several Errors, but I find them not only Innovators and Blame-worthy in several things, but that which is worse, they take upon them to reform us.* It is worth while to observe what kind of Union this was, which being perfected, the Pope declares on his side, that neither he nor his *Latins* had considered the Liturgy of the *Greeks*, and the Emperor on the other hand, protests the *Latins* are Innovators, and guilty of several Errors. ScH. 10. c. 11.

BUT, say's Mr. *Arnaud*, supposing Policy hindred the *Greeks* from opposing the Doctrine of Transubstantiation, what end could Syropulus have in concealing from us this Mystery? Why discovering to us as he does, his Countrymens weakness; he mentions not one word concerning that which ought to be the chief Subject of his History? Why does he not blame the Ceremonies of the *Latins*? Why has he not detested in his History the Adoration of the Host, and Feast of the Holy Sacrament, of which he was a Witness? Why did he not deplore the Abominations of those of his Nation, that were present at the Popish Mass, who shewed it the same Respect as the *Latins*, which is to say, adored the Eucharist. To all these Wherefores, I shall oppose others: Why did not Syropulus take notice of the Silence of the *Greeks* and *Latins*, on the Article touching the Salvation of the Damned, and Christ's descent into Hell, and offering them his Gospel? Why did he not censure the Neglect of both one and th'other, in that they mentioned not a word concerning the Marriage of Priests, nor communion under both kinds, nor of all those other Articles I denoted in this Chapter? These kind of Questions which Mr. *Arnaud* makes, are good for nothing but to impose on inconsiderate Persons? Syropulus is an Historian that contents himself with relating what passed of moment in this Affair, and sometimes to give his Opinion in general thereupon; but it plainly appears he never intended to reflect on every Particular wherein his Nation was concern'd. A History is not a Dispute: Wherefore then should he Discourse of Transubstantiation in it? Why blame the Ceremonies of the *Latins*, or detest the Adoration of the Sacrament, and its Feast? Why tell us of the Adoration which the *Greeks* rendered to the Host of the *Latins*, seeing he assures us on the contrary, that they stood bolt upright during the Liturgy? Mr. *Arnaud* who calls upon others so much, to think upon what they write; has he I say, considered what he saies concerning the Feast of the Holy Sacrament? Wherefore, say's he, has not Syropulus detested the Feast of the Holy Sacrament, of which he was a Witness? For I shall only tell him: He has not mentioned a word of it, and yet 'tis certain the *Greeks* do not approve it, but on the contrary condemn it, as I already shew'd in the foregoing Book. It does not then follow the *Greeks* hold Transubstantiation, altho Syropulus speaks not of it.

AND thus much concerning the Council of Florence. Mr. *Arnaud* likewise

Lib. 4. c. 3.  
p. 355.

Pag. 347.

wife draws some Arguments from what passed after the *Greeks* had renounced this Union. And first he takes for granted, that Transubstantiation was established in this Council, and that the *Greeks* solemnly approved of it. On this Principle he runs on arguing beyond all bounds, that those that violated the Union, should inveigh against this Doctrine of the *Latins*, and those that approved it. He introduces again *Syropulus*, and alledges *Marc* of *Ephesus*, and describes his Hatred against the *Latins*: He tells us of a Synod held at *Jerusalem*, against the Patriarch *Metrophanus*, and those of his Party. *This was the time, say's he, if ever, to reproach those with Transubstantiation that had consented to the Union, and approved this Doctrine in it.* He takes Occasion hence to bless God the *Greeks* had renounced this Union, acknowledging the Divine Providence therein, which permitted it thus to come to pass, to the end he might not want matter for his Book. *Whatsoever we related, say's he, touching the Greeks approbation of Transubstantiation would have less force, had this Agreement subsisted. It would have been alledged that politick Interest having made the Greeks consent to the receiving of this Doctrine, they were afterwards withheld by Fear from condemning it, and being insensibly accustomed to it, dared not immediately reject it, by reason of the bad estate of their Affairs. But to the end their real Belief might appear in this Subject, it was necessary this Agreement should be disturbed, and their Passion at liberty to break out, that they should endeavour to make void whatsoever they had confirmed at Florence: That they should attack the Union in all possible manners, and denote whatsoever they could gainsay, reproachfully charge and calumniate the Latins with whom they had treated, and the Greeks who had consented to the Union, that their Hatred and Rage should discover itself without Disguise and Constraint.*

ADMIRE I beseech you this flight of Fancy, and vast extent of Thought. The Good and Evil which beset the Christian World two hundred Years ago, appears design'd for the Glory of Mr. *Arnaud's* Book, with this only Difference, that the Evils contribute to it more than the Good; for 'tis the Schism, Passion, Hatred, and Rage of the *Greeks* which give him a compleat Victory. *It was necessary, say's he, they should be thus furious, which is as much as to say, it was necessary half of the World should be damned, according to him, that God should be dishonoured by a thousand Crimes, and his Church torn to pieces by a dreadful Division. And why? For to furnish Mr. Arnaud with an Argument, and that he might have Matter for one Chapter more.*

BUT he will be much amazed to find this Argument so dear bought, to conclude nothing, being grounded on a false Supposition. For 'tis false the *Greeks* approved Transubstantiation in the Council of *Florence*: That they Disputed not of it, I acknowledg, but that they approved it I deny. *Bessarion* speaking in their Name, say's, *that the Bread is Consecrated, and made the Body of Christ*; and the Decree bears, *that the Body of Jesus Christ is truly Consecrated: Therefore they approved Transubstantiation.* What a Consequence here is? Mr. *Arnaud* has a Secret above my Apprehension, for he can change the very Nature of things, he can diminish and augment them as he pleases. But the Misery on it is, this appears contrary to Reason. Why will he have the new Schism of the *Greeks*, to have hapned meerly for the furnishing him with an Argument? It was not known in those days he was to make a Book. Why will he have the *Greeks* approve Transubstantiation at *Florence*? Seeing there was not the least mention of it? Why must those that broke the Union, reproach the others with approving the Doctrine of the *Latins*?  
Why

Why will he have *Syropulus*, *Marc of Ephesus*, and the Council of *Jerusalem*, to declaim on this Point, seeing they had no reason to do so. Certainly such gross Illusions as these, deserved not such Exclamations.

IT only remains for the finishing of this Chapter, and this matter of Negative Arguments, to show a Reason for the Silence of the *Latins*, and that will be no hard matter to do. The *Latins* have innovated in the Doctrine of the *Eucharist*: They have grounded their Innovations on certain Expressions of the Fathers, which bear that the Bread is the Body of Jesus Christ, that it is changed into the Body of Jesus Christ. They have made it their Business for some Ages, to make the World believe these Terms signify a true and real Conversion of the Substance of Bread, into that of the Body of Christ, to defend themselves by this means from the Reproach of Innovation. Observing then that the *Greeks* do commonly use these kind of Expressions, and even added to 'em some others which seem more emphatical; as for Instance, that the Bread is not a Figure, that it is the true Body of Jesus Christ, and that the Body born of the Virgin, and the Bread, are not two things, but one and the same; they well knew it was their Interest to rest satisfied with these general Expressions, altho in effect they signify nothing less than Transubstantiation. Had they condemned them as insufficient, and urged the *Greeks* to admit of theirs, they would at the same time condemned themselves as Innovators. They chose then rather to pass over softly this Article, than to venture near a Rock against which their Cause ran a risk of being dashed to pieces. And this obliged them in their Dealings with the *Greeks*, to content themselves with their Expressions, and accommodate themselves to 'em, that they might not move 'em, as appears by the Formulary of the Reunions already mentioned, and Decree of the Council of *Florence*, wherein was used only the word *τελειῶσαι* in Greek, and *Consecrari* in Latin.

YET we must not imagine but that judicious Persons amongst the *Latins*, and especially those that had the Government in their Hands, saw well enough the Difference, between these general Expressions of the *Greeks*, and the precise and determinate ones of the Roman Church. That learned Man I mentioned in the seventh Chapter of the foregoing Book, (who was consulted on the Articles which the *Russians* in *Poland*, proposed in order to their Reunion with the Roman Church, amongst which was this, that they should not be obliged to Celebrate *Corpus Christi* Feast, nor carry about the Sacrament in Procession) answered, *That as to what concern'd the Procession, it was not a*

*Thom. a Jesu.  
Lib. 6. p. 3.  
c. 3.*

*matter to stick at, but there were things of greater Importance to be considered touching the Sacrament. De processione infesto corporis non laborarem, multa tamen circa hoc Sacramentum examinanda sunt.* And therefore when particular Persons amongst the *Greeks* imbrace the Roman Religion, the usual terms of their Church are not counted sufficient, but they are made to understand distinctly the substantial Conversion, and to receive the term of Transubstantiation, as we already offered in the Procession of Faith they are obliged to make. Hence proceed all those Efforts since so long a time, to introduce insensibly amongst the *Greeks* this Belief, by means of false *Greeks*, as appears by the Example of that Monk mentioned by Mr. *Basire*, who had slyly insinuated the word *μετσινωσις*, in his Catechism, and was censured for it by the rest. When the Scholars of the Seminaries are sent into *Greece*, to live amongst the Schismaticks, and procure the establishment of the Roman Religion, they are made to sign the Confession of Faith I now mentioned, which expressly denotes Transubstantiation: So likewise is their Language far different

rent



rent from that of the real *Greeks*, as appears by the Example of the great *Payfius Ligaridius*, and the terrible Baron of *Spartaris*. And this is evident in the *Greeks* that imbrace the Romish Religion, for they speak not as others, nor as they did themselves before their Conversion, as I already instanced in *Bessarion*, *Emanuel Calecas*, and *Fohn Plusiadene*.

Poffevin. Bil.  
fol. 15. c. 24.

IT is the *Latins* great Interest not to dispute against the *Greeks* on all the Points wherein the two Churches differ; And therefore they give in charge to the Emissaries, to use the greatest Caution in handling Controversies. *It is sometimes expedient to fall upon Controversies*, say's *Poffevin*, but they must be warily and moderately handled: Neither must a Man mention any of these five Articles which were heretofore the principal ones, and which the Synod of Florence and Gennadius handled. For now the Controversies of the Azyne and Eucharist are no longer agitated, neither in Candia, nor any other of the Eastern Parts. And therefore these Points cannot again be received, without giving just Offence. As to the Article of the Procession of the Holy Spirit, there are few that understand it, and should it again be controverted, 'tis likely 'twould happen that those who were ignorant of it before, would after Inquiry into that, pass over to other things.

Lib. 2. c. 11.  
p. 910.

THE *Latins* greatest Interest then, consists in two things; the first, to subject the *Greeks* by any means to the Roman See; and th'other, insensibly to change the ancient form of their Religion, and slyly introduce amongst them the Doctrines and Rites of the Latin Church. To accomplish the first of these, the *Latins* act and yield every thing as far as the Honour of their Church will permit them, and according as they find fewer or more Difficulties. Mr. Arnaud himself has discovered something of this, when he told us that in the Council of Constantinople held under *Emanuel Comnenus*, The *Latins* only required of the *Greeks* that they should mention the Pope's Name in their publick Prayers, acknowledge his Supremacy, and the right of Appeals to him; the rest at that time being not regarded. We have likewise seen that *Michael Paleologus* perswaded his Bishops to Imbrace the Union, seeing there were no more required of them than these three Points. Yet the Article touching the Holy Spirit, was so ancient and famous a Difference between them, that 'twas a hard matter to reunite therein, and take no notice of it, and we find the *Greeks* themselves mentioned it, because it had been one of the chief Causes of their Separation. The *Latins* then not being able to pass over this Point in Silence, offered the *Greeks* sometimes, that provided they received this Doctrine in their Belief, that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son, they might keep their Symbol as it was, without expressly adding the *Filioque*. And this the Popes Legats who were at Nice after the taking of Constantinople, told them as from him, according to Mr. Arnaud's Relation. The Pope, say they, will not constrain the *Greeks* to add this Clause expressly in the Symbol, when they shall sing it in the Church. And it was upon this Condition that the Reunion was made in the Council of Florence: But when the *Latins* saw a more favourable Occasion, they extended their Pretensions farther, and changed their Custom, as will appear by what I am now going to say. *Nicholas* the III sent Legats into Greece to the Emperor *Michael Paleologus* to solicit him, to oblige his Patriarch and Prelates to make their Profession of Faith, which they had not yet made, and renounce their Schism. The Emperor earnestly besought the Pope to leave the Symbol untouched, and not oblige the *Greeks* to sing it with the addition of the *Filioque*, to prevent all Tumults: But *Michael* being known to be a Prince devoted, (for his interest)

Lib. 3. c. 2.

rest) to the Roman Church, and therefore might be easily prevailed on, the Pope gave order to his Legats to answer him touching this Article, as follows. *That the Unity of the Catholick Faith permits not Diversity in its Confessions, either in the Act of Profession, or in the Channi, or any particular Declaration of Faith.* Much less was this to be suffered in the publick singing of the Creed, where-<sup>*Allit. de*</sup> in Uniformity ought especially to appear, in as much as this Chant comes often in their Service. Wherefore, adds he, the Church of Rome has determin'd, and resolved that the Creed shall be sung in Conformity as well by the Greeks as Latins, with this addition of the Filioq; The Greeks were not so rigorously dealt withal at Nice, nor Florence: The Unity of Faith suffered under Gregory the IX, and Eugenius the IV, what it could not bear under Nicholas the III: Which is as much as to say, that the Faith yields as oft as need requires, to this great Interest of submitting the Greeks to the See of Rome. The Greeks are complied withal, when it cannot be helpt, and the Spirit of Domination becomes Master of that of the Dispute.

AS to the second Interest, which consists in changing insensibly the Religion of the Greeks, and silyly insinuating the Doctrine and Rites of the Roman Church in its stead, it appears from the Course they take, that this is the Design of the Latins. It is for this purpose that Seminaries have been set up at Rome, and other places, and the whole East long since overspread with Emissaries. It is in order to this, that the Emissaries apply themselves to the converting of the Greek Bishops, and instructing of Youth in the Roman Religion, under pretence of teaching them the Tongues and Philosophy. And 'tis for this end likewise, that the Scholars of the Seminaries are entertained and sent into Greece; they have the Liberty to receive Orders from the Hands of schismatical Bishops, and the Bishopricks are indeavoured to be filled with them, and they are sometimes promoted to Patriarchates. It is clear that in taking this Course, they have no need to dispute it out with 'em.

IT will not, I suppose be amiss to observe here what *Thomas a Fesú* (who wrote a Book touching the means for the Converting of Infidels, Hereticks, and Schismatics) tells us, is the ready way to convert all Greece to the Catholick Faith. His Holiness, say's he, who is so vigilant for the Salvation of Souls, must take care, that as soon as ever the Patriarchal Church of Constantinople becomes void, to pitch upon one of the Scholars of the Seminaries, or Monks who have taken upon them Ecclesiastical Charges in Grece. He must choose one whom he thinks most fitting, and give him notice thereof, but as privately as may be, lest the Greeks come to know 'tis he that gives him the Patriarchal Church of Constantinople, Elects and Confirms him Patriarch. For this effect his Holiness must order him to betake himself to Constantinople, where he will find Ambassadors already prepared by his Holiness, who by the Presents they shall make the Turk, (on whom the Election and Confirmation of the Patriarch depends, altho unjustly,) will obtain, by adding something to the usual Tribute, that he command the Greeks to choose for their Patriarch, him whom his Holiness shall design. They will no sooner demand this, than obtain it; for Money will make the Tyrant do any thing, as appears by the little Difficulty he makes of taking away the Patriarchal Dignity from those that have it already. Moreover there ought to be no scruple made of this, as if it were a kind of Simony: For this is not a setting the Patriarchate upon Sale, seeing his Holiness has already given it, Money is only made use of to remove some Difficulties. Now Divines are unanimous in their Opinions, that we may free our selves from Vexations and Obstructions, by means of Money. Neither can it be alledged that hereby the Metropolitans

will be deprived of their right of Election; for 'tis clear their Elections are invalid, being as they are Schismatics, and consequently have no Jurisdiction: Moreover it seems to be rather the Turk that makes the Election, than they, for they Consecrate him whom he Presents. So that here will this Advantage redound from this aforementioned Election. 1st. That as fast as the Schismatical Bishops dye, the Scholars of the Seminary, or others, of whose Judgment there is no cause to doubt, will take their places. 2d. The Reformation of the Schismatics may be happily undertaken and effected in particular Synods. But his Holyness must never despair nor be weary, or think it sufficient that he has elected one Patriarch. He must on the contrary substitute another again and again, ever putting Scholars of the Seminary into the places of the Deceased, until all the old Schismatical Prelates be dead, and their places filled with Catholics. And seeing that the Election of Patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch depend likewise on the Turk, because they are Greeks; and that the Government of these Churches is in the Hands of Greeks, the same Measures must be taken in respect of them, by means of Ambassadors. It is certain that this Affair will be successful, for Money does all things in this Country. So that all the Patriarchs being Roman Catholic, and their Duty obliging them to establish Catholic Bishops and Curats according as their Wisdom shall direct them; nothing will hinder us from saying in a short time, behold one Flock, and one only Shepherd. The Schismatical Prelates will be rooted out, and those who from their Infancy have been piously brought up in the Bosom of the Catholic Church, will take their places. These new Prelates by the uprightness of their Lives, and soundness of their Doctrine, may govern a People who are only Erroneous upon the account of their natural Facility and Proneness to believe what their Bishops tell them. And this is the Course Thomas a Jesu would have taken, and not that of Disputes and Controversies.

## CHAP. VII.

Several Passages of Greek Authors (Cited by Mr. Arnaud) Examined.

THAT which remains to be examined of Mr. Arnaud's Dispute touching this matter of the Greeks since the eleventh Century, will not long detain us. He produces some Passages out of *Theophylact*, *Euthymius*, *Nicholas Methoniensis*, *Cabasilas*, *Simeon de Thessalonica*, *Jeremias* the Patriarch of Constantinople, and several of the Greek Books of Divinity. They are the same we find in all the Controvertists in *Bellarmin*, *Cardinal Perron*, *Coccinus*, *Father Nouet*, and especially *Allatius*, from whom it seems Mr. Arnaud has taken them, rather than from their Originals. It will be a needless Labour to relate them at length, one after another, together with Mr. Arnaud's Commentaries on them: It will be sufficient I examine as much as is necessary to give the true Sence of them, and to discover Mr. Arnaud's Errors; which I hope to do so clearly, that the Readers will remain satisfied.

FIRST,



FIRST, *Theophylact, Euthymius, Cabasilas, and Feremias*, assure us that the Bread of the *Eucharist* is not an *Antitype*, that is to say a Figure; or Representation, but *the very Body it self of Jesus Christ*, because he did not say, *this is the Antitype*, but *this is my Body*. I grant all this, and I joyn all these four Authors together on this Head, that I may thereby avoid Mr. *Arnaud's* Prolixity, who having propos'd them one after another, could not avoid the oft repeating of the same Inductions and Arguments: One Answer shall serve for all. *Theophylact*, say's he, keeps to the propriety of Words, he excludes whatsoever varies from 'em: He overthrows and absolutely rejects all metaphorical Significations, and keeps close to the literal Signification of the Word *EST*. *Euthymius*, say's he, excludes the Key of Figure, and plainly shows he has not taken the Word *EST* in the Sense of *SIGNIFICAT*. He has then taken it in a Sense of Reality. From whence he concludes that these Authors could not mean that the Bread is the Body of Christ in *Virtue*, seeing they would argue contrary to their Intention; For as our Saviour said not, *This is the Figure*, nor that the Bread he would give should be the Figure; so neither has he said, that he would give the *Virtue* of his Flesh, or that the Bread he would give, should contain the *Virtue* of his Flesh.

Lif. 2. c. 9.

p. 180.

C. 12. p. 217.

I answer, Mr. *Arnaud* need not trouble himself with shewing us that the *Greeks* admit not the figurative Sense in our Saviour's Words. neither take the Term *EST* in the Sense of *SIGNIFICAT*. We grant it him: And we grant likewise that we agree not with them in this. But the Question here is to know, whether it thence follows they believe Transubstantiation. Now I maintain that not only this does not follow, but that the contrary does; for they hold a kind of middle way between the Sense of Figure and that of Transubstantiation. In a word, they believe that the Bread remaining Bread (as to its Substance) is yet the proper Body of Christ, by Augmentation of the natural Body, as we already shewed in the last Chapter of the foregoing Book. What does Mr. *Arnaud* desire more? Would he have us shew, that the *Greeks* believe the Bread is made the Body of Christ by this means, in the same manner the Food we eat becomes our Body? They say so in exprefs terms. Would he have us shew him, that by this means, the Substance of Bread loses not its Existence, nor is changed into the proper Substance of the Body that 'twas before? The thing it self speaks as much, and we have shewed it in its place, as clearly as a thing of this Nature can be shew'd. Does he doubt that the *Greeks* believe by this means, to keep the precise and literal Sense of our Saviour's Words? They do themselves declare that they understand them no otherwise. Would he have this, in fine, to be but a bad way of keeping the literal Sense? The *Greeks* maintain the contrary, and alledg for this Effect the Instance of Food which is made one with our Body, by this same way of Assimilation and Augmentation, and that it cannot be said these are two Bodies, but one and the same Body.

BUT as, say's he, our Saviour said not, *this is the Figure*, so neither did he say, *this is the Virtue of my Body*, but *this is my Body*. 1<sup>st</sup>. This is to dispute against the *Greeks*, and not against us, who never undertook to warrant the Truth of their Opinions. 2<sup>d</sup>. They will answer him this Impression of Virtue is sufficient to make the Bread our Lord's Body without a Figure, and there is no need of a change of Substance, because the Substance of Food is not precisely changed into that which we have already, but only added to it, to make a Growth, or Augmentation, yet becomes our

Body in a proper and literal Sence, not a Figure, but our Body it-self, not another Body, but the same we had before. Besides they will affirm that the Sence of the Roman Church is not a literal Sence: For the literal Sence of our Saviour's Words must retain two things. First, that 'tis Bread, and secondly, that 'tis the Body of Christ, which Transubstantiation does not.

*Lib. 2. c. 9. p. 179.* *Comment. in Orat. 1. Greg. Naz.* *Cyrill. apud Victor. Ante MS. in Bibl. Reg.* BUT, say's Mr. Arnaud, Baptism contains the Virtue of Christ's Blood, and yet we do not say, Baptism is not the Figure of it, but the Blood it self of Christ. I answer, that this is still to dispute against the Greeks, and not against me. For supposing it were more true than it is, that the Water of Baptism is not mentioned, like as the Greeks speak of the Bread in the Eucharist; yet still these two things are certain; First, that they affirm the Bread to be the Body of Christ by this Impression of Virtue; and secondly, that 'tis thus they Understand the Words, This is my Body. *Ely de Crete having told us that God changes the Oblations, into the Efficacy of his Flesh.* Immediately adds, and doubt not of the Truth of this, seeing he himself plainly say's, *this is my Body, this is my Blood.* It is apparent he grounds this change of the Bread into the Efficacy of Flesh, on the express Words of our Saviour; Whence it follows that 'tis thus he understands them. *Cyrillus of Alexandria, having likewise said in the same manner, that God changes the Oblations into the Efficacy of his Flesh, adds, that we must not doubt of the Truth of this, seeing he has said it,* which evidently shews that according to him, these Words, *this is my Body,* signifies no more, than that this has the Efficacy of my Body, or is my Body in Efficacy. Yet should we take upon us to reply in behalf of the Greeks, to the Instance or Example Mr. Arnaud alledges touching Baptism; We might tell him that the Reason why they express not themselves in the same manner in reference to the Water, as they do to the Bread, is because our Saviour never said of it, this is my Blood, as he said of the Bread, this is my Body; and that the Holy Scripture having differently explained it self touching Baptism, and the Eucharist, we must not think it strange, if Divines have expressed themselves about them in a different manner. He may be moreover answered, that the same *Oeconomy* observed touching the Body and Blood of Christ, is not observed in the Water of Baptism, as it is observed in the Bread and Wine in the Eucharist, and therefore it cannot be so well said that the Water becomes the Blood by this way of Growth and Augmentation, as may be said of the Bread, altho it receives the Impression of the Virtue of Blood.

AS to what Mr. Arnaud adds that the Ministers acknowledg these Words; *this is my Body,* must be either understood in a real, or figurative Sence, whence it follows according to him, that *Theophylact* understood them in one or the other of these. I say this Reasoning is false, as well in its Principle, as Consequence: For the Ministers do not acknowledg either that we ought, or can understand these Words, in this Sence of Reality the Church of Rome gives them. We all hold that this is an absurd and impossible Sence, and that none but a figurative one can subsist. But supposing the Ministers should say what he makes them, why would he have us regulate thereby the Sence of *Theophylact* and other Greeks. They have argued on their own Hypothesis, and not on that of the Ministers: Whether their Hypothesis be justifiable, or not, is not to be disputed with the Ministers, for Mr. Arnaud was never yet told that the Greeks were agreed in all things with us. It is sufficient that on one hand, he be shewed in what manner the Greeks pretend the proper Sence of our Saviour's Words is observed, and on the other, that this manner, whatsoever it be,

be, Good, or Bad, Justifiable, or Unjustifiable, Conformable, or not Conformable to what the Ministers say, is directly opposite to Transubstantiation, for our only Question is, Whether the *Greeks* believe Transubstantiation or not.

THIS is then a mere Illusion to explain *Theophylact* by what the Ministers say or not say, and it is yet a greater, to tell us as if it were a thing earnestly Disputed between him and us, that *Euthymius* excludes the Key of Figure, and does not take the Word *E S T* in the Sense of Significat; that 'tis not like-ly we would borrow *Euthymius* his Words to instruct a Man in our Opinion, and that we are not wont to say, that *Christ* gave us not the Figure of his Body, but his Body, because he said, *this is my Body*. And thus do Men argue that impose on the World, which Mr. *Arnaud* never fails of doing.

Lib. 2. c. 124

HAVING produced these Arguments, which in my Mind have not proved very successful to him, he offers us others, drawn from the Doubts or Difficulties, which the *Greeks* propose to themselves, as arising from their Sentiment, and which they endeavour to resolve in the best manner they can. *Theophylact*, say's he, testifies there arises naturally a Doubt from what Faith teaches concerning this Mystery, that the Bread is really the Flesh of *Christ*, which difficulty he expresses in these Words. *Quomodo*, inquit, *neque enim caro videtur*; How can this be? For this Bread does not seem to me to be Flesh: Whence he observes the natural Consequence of this Change must be, that the Bread being Flesh must appear to be so, and seeing it does not, 'tis astonishing. Et quomodo, inquit aliquis, non apparet caro sed Panis? Now, say's he, let a man take *Aubertin's*, or Mr. *Claude's* Gloss, to expound *Theophylact*, and we shall find nothing can be more Extravagant. For this is as much as to say according to them, if it be true the Bread contains the Virtue of *Christ's* Body, how comes it to pass, that it does not appear to us to be Flesh? Whence is it we see only Bread and not Flesh? Is it not ridiculous to make People reason after so absurd a manner. And why must this Bread containing only the Virtue of *Christ's* Body appear Flesh, when it is not so? Does it follow from the Breads partaking of a spiritual Quality of the Flesh of *Christ*, either morally or physically, that it must appear Flesh? Would it not be on the contrary a dreadful Prodigy, if the Flesh of *Christ* being only in Virtue in the Bread of the Eucharist, should appear Flesh.

Lib. 2. c. 9.  
p. 183.

AND this is Mr. *Arnaud's* Reasoning, set forth with its usual Sweetness, that is to say, of Extravagancies and Absurdities, with which he charges both me and Mr. *Aubertin*. I answer he is under a Mistake, and such a kind of Mistake too, wherein his Reputation is deeply concern'd; for he takes for the Ground of *Theophylact's* Doubt, that which is on the contrary the Solution of it, as will appear by what follows. Now a Man cannot fall into a greater Error, than to take for the cause of a Doubt, that which is the Solution thereof, and which makes the Doubt cease. To Disspel then this vain Shadow, under which he has disguised the Passage of *Theophylact*, we need only examine the several Parts of this Author's Discourse, and show their mutual Dependence. Immediately treating on the Words of *Christ*, he rejects the Sense of Figure. *Iesus Christ*, say's he, in his Commentary on St. Mathew, by these Words, *this is my Body*, shows us that the Bread which is consecrated on the Altar, is the Lord's own Body, and not an Antitype. For he did not say, *This is the Antitype*, but, *this is my Body*, this Bread being changed by an ineffable Operation, altho it appears to us to be still Bread. He say's the same thing on the sixth Chapter of St. *John*, and the fourteenth of St. *Marc*. So far he asserts that the Bread is the Body it self, and Flesh of *Christ*; but he does

Comm. in Mat.  
c. 26.



does not explain after what manner it is so. Now because from this Proposition thus generally conceived, and not explained, there may arise two difficulties; one, how the same thing can be Bread and Flesh; th'other, how it does not appear to us to be Flesh, but Bread; *Theophylact* proposes 'em both, and resolves 'em. He proposes the first in these Terms: *The Bread is changed into our Lord's Flesh by mystical Words, by the mystical Blessing, and coming of the Holy Spirit: And let no body be troubled that he must believe the Bread is Flesh.* He resolves it by the Example of the Bread which Christ eat, and which was changed into his Body, and became like unto his Flesh in augmenting it, and nourishing it. *The Lord, say's he, when as yet in the World, receiving his Nourishment from Bread, this Bread he took, was changed into his Body, and became like unto his Flesh, and contributed to augment and sustain it after a natural manner, so inlike sort this Bread is now changed into our Lord's Flesh.*

IT is plain, this Answer supposes that the Bread is made the Body of Christ by way of Augmentation, and by a kind of Assimilation, as the Bread which he eat whilst on earth, became his Body. Now first we see that this is not the Romane Transubstantiation: The substance of Bread which the Lord eat, was not changed into the same Substance which he had before, it was joyned unto it, and made like it: But moreover what relation has this with the Difficulty which *Theophylact* proposed to himself? Is it not evident that it must be solved after another manner, supposing he believed Transubstantiation. For it must be said that the Bread is not Flesh, but only as it is really and substantially converted into the same Substance of this Flesh. The Romish Hypothesis would unavoidably lead him to this; but instead of this, he answers by an Example wherein Transubstantiation is not concern'd, and this shows clearly that he had not this Transubstantiation in his Thoughts.

AS to the second Difficulty, which consists in that if the Bread were Flesh, it would appear Flesh, as it may equally spring both from the Solution which he came from giving to the first Doubt, to wit, the Comparison of the Bread which Christ eat, which was changed into his Flesh; and from the general Proposition he established in the beginning, to wit, that the Bread is the Flesh and the Body it self of Jesus Christ, not his Image; he considers it likewise as coming from both one and the other of these two Principles. He proposes it in his Commentaries on *St. John*, as arising from the Solution he had given it: For having related this Comparison of the Bread Christ eat, which became his Body, he adds, *how then can it be said? Why does it appear to us to be Bread, and not Flesh.* In effect, it it be the same with the Bread of the *Eucharist*, as that which Christ eat, it seems it ought appear to us, to be Flesh as the other did. To this *Theophylact* answers, that if it appeared Flesh to us, we should be struck with Horror at the sight of it. *It is, say's he, to the end we may not conceive Horror in the eating of it: For if it appeared to us to be Flesh, we could not but abhor the Communion. It is then by an effect of God's Condescension to our Weakness, that the Mystical Food appears to us to be such as we are used to.* This Answer suffers us to conclude that 'tis not the Physical or Natural form of Flesh, which is communicated to the Eucharistical Bread, but the other; For if it received the Physical Form, as the Bread Christ eat did, it would appear Flesh as well as that Bread did. All this agrees still very well with the *Greeks* Hypothesis.

BUT some will reply, this Answer is short, for it does not sufficiently explain

plain what is this other Form which the Eucharistical Bread receives, and which makes it the Body of Christ? I reply, the Answer would be short indeed, had not *Theophylact* clearly explained himself thereon in his Commentary on *St. Marc*, wherein he proposed the same doubt, as arising from the general Proposition, that the Bread is Flesh. *This Bread*, say's he, *is not a Figure of our Lord's Body, but it is changed into the Lord's Body: The Bread which I shall give is my Flesh. He does not say 'tis the Figure of my Flesh, but my Flesh. And in another place, if you eat not the Flesh of the Son of Man. But it will be replied; how does it not appear to be Flesh? O man, 'tis because of thine Infirmities: For because the Bread and Wine are Food familiar to us, and that we are not able to suffer Blood and Flesh before us; God full of Mercy, in Condescension to our Weakness, conserves the Species of Bread and Wine, but changes them into the VIRTUE OF HIS FLESH AND BLOOD.* It is clear he means that our Weakness not suffering us to eat Bread which received the natural form of Flesh, God conserves the Bread and Wine in their proper Species; but to make them his Flesh and Blood, imprints on them this supernatural Virtue. Who sees not that the whole Scope of his Discourse tends to this; The Bread is the real Flesh of Christ, not its Representation, because there must a proper Sense be given to our Lord's Words? But if it really be this Flesh, why does it not appear Flesh? It is by an effect of God's Condescension, which seeing we are not able to bear the sight of Flesh and Blood, makes the Bread his Flesh, not by an Impression of the substantial Form of Flesh; but by an Impression of Virtue.

IT appears then from the Explication which I now gave to *Theophylact's* Discourse. 1<sup>st</sup>. That Mr. *Arnaud* has been strangely mistaken when he imagined that to expound him according to our Sense; he must say, *if it be so that the Bread contains the Virtue of Christ's Body, why does it not appear Flesh to us?* For this Doubt does not arise from the Bread's being Flesh in Virtue; on the contrary, 'tis that which dissipates the Doubt, and makes it vanish: It comes either from the general Proposition that the Bread is Flesh, and not the Figure of Flesh; or from this other Proposition, that it is Flesh even as the Bread which Jesus Christ eat was changed into his Flesh; but the Doubt resolves it self by this last Proposition, that it is changed into the Virtue of Flesh and Blood.

SECONDLY, It appears likewise from thence, that *Theophylact* had not Transubstantiation in his Thoughts: For if he had it in his Thoughts, he must have solved the Difficulty in another manner: He must have said that the appearance of Bread remains; but that its Substance is changed into the Flesh of Christ, and for this Reason does not appear Flesh, but Bread. But yet notwithstanding the Doubts would not have ceased as they do now, for it might be demanded, how this appearance of Bread subsisted alone, without its natural Substance, how our Sences could be deceived by an appearance of Bread, which was not Bread; and by a real substance of Flesh, which appears not Flesh; how this same Substance of the Flesh of Christ can be in Heaven, and on Earth at the same time; and several other such like Questions, which are not to be found in *Theophylact's* Text. 3<sup>dly</sup>. It appears likewise that *Theophylact* believed, that if the Bread was Flesh otherwise, than by an Impression of Virtue, it must needs appear Flesh. For in saying that 'tis in Condescension to our Weakness, that God changes it into the Virtue of his Flesh; he leaves it to be concluded that otherwise our Infirmities would not be succoured, and we must unavoidably behold Flesh in its natural Form.

MR,

These 2.

MR. *Arnaud* not liking this change of Virtue, which is found thus described in proper terms in *Theophylact's* Discourse, endeavours to give three different Explications of them, and leaves us at liberty to choose either of them. First, that by the virtue of Flesh, we must understand the *Reality, the internal Essence* of this Flesh. The second, that this is a way of speaking, which is usual with the *Greeks* to say ἐνέργεια, or δύναμις σάκεος the *Force, or Power* of Flesh, to signify *Flesh full of Efficacy*. The third, that when two things are joyned together in Truth, and in the Mind of those to whom we speak, it often happens that in expressing them, we denote but one, without excluding the other, and with a design to make the other understood, which we do not express by that which we do. Which he afterwards explains in these Terms. It is certain that the Consecrated Bread is changed into the Body of Christ: It is certain likewise that it becomes full of its Virtue and Efficacy. These two Truths are joyned, and are the Consequences of each other: And therefore it oft happens that Authors do jointly express them, as does *Euthymius*, who tells us in express Terms, That as *Jesus Christ* deified the Flesh he took by a supernatural Operation, so he changes the Bread and Wine after an ineffable manner into his proper Body, which is the Fountain of Life, and into his proper Blood, and into the Virtue of both one and the other. But as these two changes are still joyned in Effect, and the Fathers supposing they were joyned in the Spirit of the Faithful; It sufficed them to express the one, to make the other understood: And thus they tell us a hundred times that the Bread is changed into the Body of Christ, without expressing it is filled with its Virtue, because one follows the other, and *Theophylact* having told us several times that the Bread is changed into the Body of Christ, tells us once, that 'tis changed into its Strength, as the sequel of a Mystery which makes it conceived wholly entire, because the Faith of the Faithful does not separate the virtue of Christ's Body, from the Body it self, nor his Body from its Virtue, it never having entered into their Minds, that Christ's Body was in Heaven, and that we have only in the Eucharist its Strength and Virtue, whereas they believe that we have only this Strength and Virtue, upon the account of its being really and truly present in our Mysteries. And 'tis by these Engines Mr. *Arnaud* pretends to draw Transubstantiation from the Passage of *Theophylact*.

BUT in general, all these three Explications appear to us to be forced, and neither of 'em to be chosen: There needs not this great stir to find *Theophylact's* real Meaning. He means no more than what his Expressions plainly intimate, to wit, That the Bread and Wine are changed into the Virtue of the Flesh and Blood of Christ, and he means nothing else. Had he believed a change of Substance, he would have said so: as well as a Change of Virtue, and so much the rather as I observed, that the Difficulty which he proposed to resolve, obliged him to explain himself clearly about it. Why does not the Bread being Flesh, appear to be so? Because its Substance is only changed, and its Accidents remain. A Man that believed Transubstantiation must needs say thus.

THE first Explication especially, can have no grounds, because that when we speak of the Virtue of a thing to signify its Truth, Reality, and inward Essence: It is only when the Question concerns this Truth, or this Reality in respect of its Operation or Effects, and Mr. *Arnaud's* Instances confirm what I say. For when *St. Paul* said, speaking of Hypocrites, that they have a Form or Appearance of Godlyness μορφήν εὐσεβείας, but that they denied the Power, δύναμιν, he means, they have only a false Appearance of it, a vain Shadow, but not the Reality of it, which is seen by its Effects. So when *Hesychius* say's that



that it is to receive the Communion ignorantly, not to know the *Virtue* and *Dignity* of it, and to be ignorant that 'tis the *Body and Blood of Christ* according to *Truth*: That this is to receive the *Mystery*, and not know the *Virtue* of them; he did not mean that the *Mysteries* were the *Body and Blood of Jesus Christ in Substance*, but according to the spiritual Understanding, which is what he calls the *Truth* of the *Mystery*, it is the *Body and Blood of Christ*, because what offers it self to our sight, is only the *Shadow and Vale* of the *Mystery*; but that the *Divine Object* represented by these sensible things, is the *Body and Blood of Jesus Christ*: Which is what he calls the *Virtue of the Mystery*, because its whole *Operation and Effects* depend only on them: As to what he alledges of *Paschasius*, besides that he is an *Author* who affects *Obscurity*, as is usual with *Innovators*, and that there is a great deal of *Injustice* in regulating *Theophylact's* Sence, by his *Expressions*, besides this I say, there is nothing can hinder us from saying that when he called the internal *Essence* of things their *Virtue*, it was in respect of their *Operation and Effects*. But this cannot be said of *Theophylact*, for his *Discourse* does not concern the *Effects* of the *Eucharist*, but only to know, why the *Bread* being the *Flesh of Christ*, yet does not appear *Flesh*. If then he would say, it is because the appearance of *Bread* remains, and that its *Substance* is changed into the *Substance* of the *Body of Christ*, to what purpose should he explain himself in this manner, *it is changed into the Virtue of the Body*. Why should he say *Virtue* for *Substance*, seeing that here there was no *Question* raised about the *Efficacy* of the *Sacrament*.

MR. *Arnaud's* second Explication, is no better than the first. He tells us 'tis an usual way of speaking amongst the *Greeks*, to say ἐνέργεια or δύναμις σαρκός the *Strength, or Power of Flesh*; to signify the *Flesh* full of *Efficacy*. But not to enter into the *Discussion* of his *Criticism*, concerning which much might be said, did he only pretend to prove it by two *Verses* of *Horace*, by a *Passage* of *Paschasius Ratbert*, and another of *St. Bernard's*. I say that when *Authors* express themselves in this manner, the *Virtue of a thing*, to signify a thing full of *Virtue or Efficacy*, 'tis only when they consider this thing under the *Idea* of its *Virtue or Efficacy*, and not otherwise; Thus when *Horace* say's, *The Virtue of Scipio, and the Wisdom of Lelius*: It is because he considered them under the *Quality* of *Virtuous and Wise*, as we call the *King his Majesty*, then when we are filled with the *Idea* of his *Greatness*. It is the same in these *Expressions* 'tis πῶταμοιο, the *Force or Rapidity of the River, for a swift River*, βία Ἡρακλέους the *strength of Hercules, for the valiant Hercules*, for then they are considered under the *Idea* of their *Strength*. Our *Saviour* say's, the *Virtue of the Holy Spirit*, when he meant the *Effects* of the *Power* of the *Holy Spirit* on the *Apostles*. *St. Bernard* say's likewise in the same Sence, that the wise *Men* acknowledged the *Virtue of God* in the weak *Body* of a *Child*, because he designed to oppose the eternal *Power* of the *Divinity*, to the weakness of *Childhood*. But there is no such thing in the *Passage* of *Theophylact*, for he does not consider the *Flesh of Christ* in respect of the *Effects* which it displays on the *Faithful*, but simply considers it in *Reference* to the *Bread* which is changed into it, and the *Point* is not to know, as I have already said, why this *Bread* produces so great *Effects*; but only why being *Flesh*, it does not appear *Flesh*, but *Bread*. So that these two pretended *Explications* of *Mr. Arnaud's* are but mere *Evasions*, being *Groundless and Improbable*.

AS to the third, did ever any man see any thing more forc'd, and *Illusory*, than this whole *Discourse* he makes to establish it. When the *Bread*, say's he,

is changed into the Body of Christ, it becomes full of its Virtue and Efficacy. What means Mr. Arnaud by this? If the Bread be changed into the Substance of Christ's Flesh, it ceases to be Bread: Now that which ceases to be, is no longer filled with any thing, because 'tis absolutely no longer in being. There remains only the external Figure, and when we understand that 'tis this external Figure that is filled, we cannot say that that which is changed is filled, for 'tis not the Figure that is changed. It is certain when a Mans Head is over full of Philosophical Notions, they make him forget himself.

*IT sometimes happens*, adds he, *that Authors express these two Truths jointly together, as Euthymius has done.* But I already shewed that *Euthymius* in saying the Bread and Wine are changed into the Body and Blood, and into the Virtue of both; never designed thereby to express two different things; but only made use of two different Expressions, to signify one and the same thing; the latter of which is only the Explication of the former, his *Et*, being to be taken, for a *that is to say*.

MR. Arnaud goes on and say's that *Theophylact* having said several times the Bread is changed into the Body of Christ, tells us once 'tis changed into his Strength, as an effect of the Mystery, which makes it conceived intire. But it is easy to answer him, that when *Theophylact* say's the Bread is changed into the Body, and that it is changed into the Virtue of the Body, these are neither two distinct things, nor two parts of the Mystery, but two Expressions which signify at bottom but one and the same thing; with this Difference, that the one is general, and th'other particular, the one more confused, and th'other more distinct, the one, which gives way in some sort to the Doubt by its generality, and th'other which resolves it. It is certain he has said several times the Bread is changed into the Body, and only once, that 'tis changed into the Virtue of the Body, but it is also true, that he never said it is changed into the Substance of the Body. If he only once spake of the Change of Virtue, this once is sufficient to shew his meaning. Others have mentioned it as well as he, as *Theodorus*, *Cyrrillus of Alexandria*, *Victor of Antioch*, *Eutychius*, *Euthymius*, *Ely de Crete*. Who could ever be perswaded all these Authors (who lived in divers times) have conspired together to say always *Virtue*, and never *Substance*, altho they had in their Thoughts a Change of *Substance*, and not of *Virtue*.

THE Language of the Greeks is Conformable to that of *Paschasius* his Adversaries, as he shews us himself in his Commentary on St. *Mathew*. They said the Bread was changed into the Virtue of the Flesh of Christ, and *Paschasius* is not so nice in his Language as Mr. Arnaud. He neither say's the Virtue signifies Verity, Reality, internal Essence, nor that the Virtue of the Flesh, signifies the Flesh full of Virtue, nor that 'tis only one part of the Mystery which signifies the other. All these Turnings were not in fashion in his time: He very honestly takes this Term in the true Sence of those that used it. *I am astonished*, say's he, *at what some say now, viz. that the Eucharist is not the Flesh and Blood of Christ really, but Sacramentally; a certain Efficacy of the Flesh, not the Flesh itself, the Virtue of the Blood, but not the Blood itself.* In this manner did they understand it, who spake of a change of Virtue, and thus was it taken by *Paschasius*: But Mr. Arnaud has found that according to the Rules of his Grammar it must be taken otherwise, and as if he were the sole Judg of mens Thoughts, and Interpreter of their Sence, he assures us that this Change of Virtue, signifies a Change of Substance, by three Explications, of which he gives us the Choice.

*Paschas. Rat.*  
6. in *Mat.* 26.

MORE-

MOREOVER I know not why he should tell us, that the Faith of the Faithful never separates the Virtue of Christ's Body, from the Body itself, nor his Body from its Virtue. For if he means this generally, as his Expressions intimate, he should remember what he said just before, That Baptism contains the Virtue of Christ's Blood, in the same manner the Ministers imagine this Virtue to be contained in the Eucharist. He should have observed that in his Chapter on Nicholas Methoniensis, he positively asserts, that the Virtue of Christ's Body is communicated to the Water of Baptism, and the Oyl of Confirmation. It seems to me here's a manifest Contradiction, for if the Faithful do not separate the Virtue of Christ's Body, from the Body it self, that is to say according as he understands it from the Substance of his Body: How does the Water of Baptism, and the Oyl of Confirmation contain the Virtue of this Body, seeing 'tis out of Doubt that they contain not the Substance of them? But whence has he learned such a profound kind of Doctrine, that the Faith of the Faithful does not separate the Virtue of Christ's Body, from the Body it self? Does not this Virtue accompany the Word of God which St. Paul calls the Power of God to Salvation, and in which, notwithstanding there is not to be imagined a Presence of the Substance of Christ's Body? Does he not know that the Fathers teach, We eat our Saviour's Flesh, as well in the hearing of the Word, as in the Participation of Baptism, which can only be understood of the Virtue separated from the Substance? If Mr. Arnaud say's that he understands this as meant only of the Eucharist, besides that his Terms are general, and in manner of a Principle, which he afterwards applies to the Eucharist; besides this I say, this does not at all resolve the Question, seeing our Debate is, Whether the Virtue of the Body is in the Eucharist together with the Substance, or whether it be in it alone, and without the Substance. Wherefore must not the Faithful who acknowledg in other Particulars this Virtue without the Substance, acknowledg the same thing in the Eucharist?

AND this is what I had to say to the Passage of Theophylact, and which may likewise serve for an Illustration to what Mr. Arnaud alledges out of Nicholas Methoniensis. This Author wrote a Treatise which is inserted in the Bibliotheca Patrum, under this Title *περὶ τοῦ διαζώου καὶ λέγουσας ὅτι ὁ ιερὸς γούμεν ἅρτον καὶ οἶνον οὐκ ἐστὶ σῶμα καὶ αἷμα τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ*. Against those that doubt, and say the Consecrated Bread and Wine are not the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ.

MR. Arnaud, say's he, finds the Ministers very much perplexed touching this Doubt. But this is only an imaginary Difficulty: For what Perplexity is there in it? These People doubted whether the Bread and Wine were the Body and Blood of Christ: But did they doubt that the Bread and Wine were the Signs or Representations of the Body and Blood of Christ? No, this was not the Cause of their Doubt: Did they doubt that 'twas the Body of Christ in Virtue? Should we take their Doubt in this Sence; 'twould not be such a strange Matter as Mr. Arnaud makes it. He may declaim if he pleases, Why could not they believe Christ might morally communicate to the Bread, the Virtue of his Body? Is it a harder matter to communicate to the Bread the Virtue of Christ's Body, than to communicate it to the Water of Baptism, and the Oyl of Confirmation? This is but a Flourish, for Palladius tells us that a Monk doubted of this very thing, having had no Respect to Mr. Arnaud's Remonstrances. He doubted touching the Gifts, and said, how can the Gifts sanctify me. St. Ambrose in his Treatise de Initiatis, combats the same



Doubts touching the Virtue of Baptism: *Is this then this great Mystery which Eye hath not seen, nor Ear heard, nor yet hath entred into the Heart of Man to conceive? I see the same Water which I see every Day, is this that which must cleanse me?* Mr. Arnaud must not imagine it is so easy a matter for weak and prophane Persons, to believe a supernatural Virtue to be communicated to the Bread and Wine. We have already seen that *Cyrillus of Alexandria*, and *Ely de Creté*, having told us that God changes the Bread into the Virtue of his Body; add, *that we must not doubt of it, seeing Christ himself say's it*, which shows that this is as much a Subject of Doubt, as any thing else.

BUT there is no necessity of expounding in this Sence the Doubt of those of whom *Nicholas Methoniensis* speaks: His Expressions must not be altered. They doubted whether the Bread and Wine were the Body and Blood of Christ, and this Doubt arose from the general and usual Expressions of the *Greeks*, who positively affirm it. What can be concluded hence? The *Greeks* then understand these general Expressions in a Sence of Transubstantiation, or real Presence. I deny it, and that with Reason; for this does not follow: But it will be replied, these Doubters at least believed their Church, took them in this Sence, and 'tis likely this was the Occasion of their Doubt. Which I also deny, for if these were their Thoughts, why did they not tell us so? Why could not they say they doubted of the Truth of this Doctrine, that the Bread and Wine are changed into the Substance of the Body and Blood of Christ. To what purpose so many Words? This Proposition, *the Bread is the Body of Jesus Christ*, offended them; and which way soever they turn'd it, it could not seem to them capable of a rational Sence. Whether this Doubt arose thro want of a thro-Consideration, or whether in effect they had examined the matter, or had considered the Proposition, either confusedly in it self, or in the Exposition the *Greeks* gave of it, is more than we know, for *Nicolas Methoniensis* say's nothing of it, and we cannot inform our selves elsewhere. This is a matter of Fact, on which every Man may make his Conjectures, but yet this Principle must remain undenyable, that their Doubt arose from this Proposition, *the Bread is the Body of Jesus Christ*; and not from this other, *the Bread is Transubstantiated into the Body of Jesus Christ*.

LET Mr. Arnaud shew us if he pleases, how it happens that between these two Doubts which *Theophylact* and *Nicolas Methoniensis* propose, there arises never a one touching the substantial Conversion; for supposing the *Greeks* believed it, it could not be, but some must doubt and say, how is the Substance of Bread changed into that of the Body of Christ; even as they say'd, how is Bread Flesh? How is Bread the Body? The Languages, which according to Mr. Arnaud, are not so barren but they can furnish us with Expressions to say, *I doubt whether the Bread contains the Virtue of Christ's Body, I doubt whether it is the Figure of the Body of Christ?* Can they not likewise supply them with proper Terms, who would say, *I doubt whether the Substance of Bread is changed into the Substance of Christ's Body?*

THERE is nothing then in the Doubt of these People which *Nicholas Methoniensis* handles, which can favour Mr. Arnaud's Cause. Neither is there any thing in his Answer which will do him any Kindness. *Nicolaus Methoniensis* says, *that the Bread is changed into the Body of Christ. That this Mystical Sacrifice takes its Original from our Lord himself: That we must not despise what has been taught us by this Divine Mouth which cannot lye: That 'twas he himself told us, this is my Body, this is my Blood, and if you eat not the Flesh of*  
the

the Son of Man, nor drink his Blood, you have no Life in you. That we must not charge him with want of Power, seeing he is Almighty: That his Body was born of a Virgin above the course of Nature, and above the Thoughts and Apprehensions of Men. Mr. Arnaud is so well satisfied with these Expressions, that he cries out in a Transport of Joy, *that they are just, natural, and befitting a Bishop to Utter, that believes Transubstantiation, and Refutes those that do not!* Ibid. p. 226. But what is there in all this, which does not agree with the Sentiment of the Greeks, being such as I have represented it, in the thirteenth Chapter of the foregoing Book? The Bread is changed into the Body of Christ, by the Impression of his supernatural Virtue, and is made this Body by way of Augmentation: This is an Effect of his almighty Power, which acts above the Course of Nature; But it does not follow that this is a Transubstantiation. Had *Nicolaus Methoniensis* meant a Change of Substance, why could he not say so, the Tongues which Mr. Arnaud has so enriched when the *Virtue of the Body* was in Question, must they immediately become so poor again, when the Question concerns that of Substance? Could not they furnish this Bishop with proper Terms, to say that the Substance of Bread is changed into that of the Body? Which is what he ought to find in *Nicholas* his Expressions to bear him out in his Exultations. But Mr. Arnaud can find matter of Triumph when he pleases.

*NICOLAUS Methoniensis* continuing his Discourse, adds, *perhaps you doubt of this Mystery, and do not Believe it because you do not see Flesh and Blood.* P. 226. He means according to Mr. Claude, say's Mr. Arnaud, *perhaps you do not believe the Bread and Wine contain the Virtue of Christ's Body and Blood, because you do not see Flesh and Blood; as if there must appear Flesh and Blood, that we may believe the Bread and Wine contain the Virtue of them.* These Peoples Reasoning, adds he, would consist according to Mr. Claude in a very pleasant Argument, if the Bread and Wine Contain'd the Virtue of Christ's Body, there would appear Flesh and Blood in the Eucharist, but there does not appear Flesh and Blood; Therefore they do not contain the Virtue thereof. He enhaunceth this Remark by an Example taken from my Book, which contains, say's he, morally my Virtue, so that it may be demanded why my Person does not appear in all the Chambers wherein my Book is read.

THIS Discourse is so full of Error, that I can scarce believe it is Mr. Arnaud's own. 1<sup>st</sup>. Supposing we do attribute to these Dubitants the Argument he has formed, he cannot call it a pleasant and ridiculous Argument, as he has done, without contradicting himself, and deriding his own Maxim, which he laid down in his Chapter touching *Theophylact*, *That the Faith of the Faithful doth never separate the Virtue of Christ's Body, from the Body it self, nor his Body from his Virtue, and that it never entred into their Thoughts the Body of Christ was in Heaven, and that we receive only in the Eucharist its Strength and Virtue, whereas they believe we receive only this Strength and Virtue, from its being really and truly present in our Mysteries.* P. 182. Supposing that *Nicolaus Methoniensis* his Doubters, reasoned on the Principle of Mr. Arnaud's Believers, their Argument would contain nothing but what is natural and reasonable. For if the Virtue of Christ's Body be only in the Eucharist, upon the account of his Body being really and truly Present in it, it naturally follows there must appear Flesh therein, seeing the Virtue thereof cannot but be accompanied by this Flesh, according to Mr. Arnaud and his Faithful. This Reasoning must be wholly grounded on two Propositions, the one, that wheresoever the Body of Christ is substantially present, there must appear Flesh, this is a natural

tural Consequence ; th'other, that the Virtue of this Body is only in the *Eucharist*, because the Body it self is substantially in it, this is Mr. *Arnaud's* Faith. If this Reasoning be *Pleasant* and *Ridiculous*, it cannot be so upon the account of the first Proposition ; for as I said, it is self Evident. It must be so then by reason of the second, that is to say, upon the Account of Mr. *Arnaud's* Faith. Is it not strange Mr. *Arnaud* should forget himself so soon as ever he has leap'd out of one Chapter into another, and ridicule himself. I confess it may happen that a Man, altho otherwise considerative may fall into Contradiction ; for there are few Persons but what are lyable to Mistakes ; But it is strange a Man should combat and fall foul on himself, because that when we are earnestly intent on any Subject, the Ideas thereof return, and Attention furnishes us with that Matter which offered not it self at first. But that such a man of Parts as Mr. *Arnaud*, should Contradict and Confute himself, and Scoff at his own Assertions in the same Book, at three Chapters Distance, is in my Mind a little amazing.

II. BUT moreover, 'tis certain Mr. *Arnaud* has been plainly mistaken in the Arguing which he attributes according to us, to *Nicolaus Methoniensis* his Dubitants. For we never told him their Doubt was grounded on the Bread's being the Body of Christ in Virtue. Perhaps, say's *Nicolaus Methoniensis*, *Ye doubt of this Mystery, and do not believe it, because ye do not see Flesh and Blood in it.* Their Doubt was grounded on the general Proposition of the *Greeks*: That the Bread and Wine were the Body and Blood of Christ. *Nicolas* say's, perhaps this Proposition appeared to them incredible, because they did not see Flesh and Blood in the *Eucharist*. We should know whether these Doubters acknowledged, this was in effect the real Cause of their Doubt ; but supposing it were, all that can be concluded thence, is that they would Reason in this sort, If the Bread be the Body of Christ it must appear Flesh ; But it does not, therefore it is not Flesh. This Reasoning opposes the Expression of the *Greeks*, that the Bread is the Body of Christ, as also the Example which they gave of it, to wit, of the Bread which our Saviour eat ; but it does not disagree with the Exposition which they gave of it, which is, that it is the Body of Christ in Virtue ; on the contrary we have already observed, that *Theophylact* uses this Exposition for the solving of the Objection contained in this Reasoning : Which plainly shews that whilst this Proposition, *the Bread is the Body of Christ*, stands alone, and unexplained ; it may give occasion to Ignorant People to form this Objection, but as soon as 'tis explained and shewed in what Sence the *Greeks* understand it, the Doubt vanishes.

AND this will more plainly appear, if we consider the Answer which *Nicolaus Methoniensis* made to those that doubted, for it comes very near to that of *Theophylact*. God, say's he, *respecting our Weakness, lest we should conceive Horror at the Pledges of Eternal Life, as being not able to indure the sight of Flesh and Blood, does therefore deliver to us things familiar to our Nature, and has joyned to them his Divinity, saying, this is my Body, this is my Blood.* This Answer does in a manner explain in what Sence the *Greeks* believed the Bread was the Body of Christ, to wit, by its Union with the Divinity, which does very well solve the Argument of the Doubters, and bereaves it of its Strength. For if it be the Body of Christ only by this means, to wit, by its Union with the Divinity, there is no longer occasion to say it should appear Flesh.

IT is then clear that this whole Dispute of *Nicolaus Methoniensis* overthrows Transubstantiation, as well as that of *Theophylact*. For as to those that



that doubted, had they known the Greek Church taught that the Substance of Bread is changed into that of the Body, they would have grounded their Objection, not on the general Proposition, *that the Bread is the Body*; but on the particular one, to wit, *that the Bread is changed into the Substance of the Body*, whence it more strongly and distinctly follows that it ought to appear Flesh after the Change. And as to the Answer return'd them, they must have been told that the Substance only is changed, and that the Accidents of Bread remain to serve as a Vail to the Flesh of Christ; This is what ought to be answered on the *Hypothesis* of Transubstantiation, and not that the Bread is joyned to the Divinity. This Answer would be absurd if we suppose Transubstantiation, for the Difficulty would still remain, Why the Bread becoming the Substance of our Lord's proper Flesh, it does not appear Flesh? Yet *Nicolaus Methoniensis* will have these Objectors rest satisfied with his Answer, and extends not their Doubts any farther.

## CHAP. VIII.

*The Profession of Faith which the Sarracens were caused to make in the twelfth Century, considered; several Passages out of Cabasilas, Simeon Archbishop of Thessalonica, Jeremias the Patriarch of Constantinople, and several others, Collected by Mr. Arnaud out of Greek Authors: Examined.*

**W**E have already rehearsed the Profession of Faith which the Greeks of the twelfth Century caused the *Sarracens* to make, that imbraced the Christian Religion; to shew the *Greeks* kept themselves to the general Expressions of the Bread and Wines being the Body and Blood of Christ, and how they are changed into this Body and Blood; leaving to God the Knowledge of the manner thereof. It is certain this is all can be concluded thence, and yet Mr. *Arnaud* has not fail'd to draw this Profession of Faith to his Advantage: But seeing he designed to make a Proof of it, it seems to me, he ought at least to rehearse truly the Terms of it, and not alter them as he has done in his Version. *I believe, say's the Convert, and confess the Bread and Wine which are mystically Sacrificed by the Christians, and of which they partake in their Divine Sacraments.* This Clause thus expressed, has not contented Mr. *Arnaud*, and therefore he has not thought good to relate it in this Form, altho it be so in the Greek and Latin Version. *I believe also, say's the Sarracen, that these things are in truth the Body and Blood of Christ, being changed by his Divine Virtue intellectually and invisibly above all humane Understanding. AS IS BEST KNOWN TO HIMSELF.* These are so far the true Expressions of the Profession; Here follows Mr. *Arnaud's* Version. *I am persuaded, I believe, I confess that the Bread and Wine mystically Consecrated by the Christians, and of which they partake in the Celebration of the Holy Mysteries, are in truth the Body and Blood of our Lord, being changed by his Divine Virtue, in a manner not to be perceived by our Eyes, and discernible only to the Mind, but surpassing*

*Bibl. Patr. tom. 2. Grec. Lat.*

*Lib. 2. c. 15. p. 247.*

surpassing all the Thoughts of Men, and which is only comprehended by God alone, and so I promise that I will partake of it with other faithful People, as being in truth his Flesh and Blood. By this means. 1<sup>st</sup>. He confounds two things which the Profelyte distinguishes; The one is to Confess the Bread and Wine of which the Christians partake, and the other, to Confess that this Bread and Wine are in truth the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ. These two Clauses being thus distinguished, it is clear the first supposes that 'tis Bread and Wine; and this Mr. Arnaud would conceal by confounding them in one. 2<sup>dly</sup>. Instead of rending νοεῖν τε καὶ ἀσχετῶς Intellectually and Invisibly, he has taken such a Circuit as changes the Sence: In a manner, say's he, which our Eyes do not discover, and which is discernable only to the Mind: To hinder the Readers from observing that the Change in Question is Spiritual and Mystical, not Sensible, or Material, for this is precisely what is meant by this νοεῖν τε καὶ ἀσχετῶς. 3<sup>dly</sup>. Instead of these Terms, As he alone knows ὡς οὐδὲ μόνος αὐτός which gives us to understand that God only determinately knows what this Spiritual and Mystical Change is; He has Translated, In a manner Comprehended by God alone, to accommodate this to the Doctrine of the Roman Church, which expressly determines the Change of one Substance into another; But not being able to disentangle herself from the Difficulties she finds in this Doctrine, sends us to God.

AND yet with all these Alterations Mr. Arnaud can conclude nothing from this Profession of Faith, unless it be, that the Bread and Wine are in truth the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, and that they are changed by his Divine Virtue: But this is not the Point we disputed on: They are then changed in respect of their Substance: It is this Consequence which we deny. In Effect, whether the Bread and Wine are the Body and Blood of Christ by a change of Virtue, and by way of Augmentation, as the Greeks explain it, or otherwise; it is certain that they are so truly, and not falsely; So this Profession of Faith then means no more than this, that we must believe the Bread and Wine are not vainly and imaginarily the Body and Blood of our Lord, but really and truly, altho God only knows how they are changed, or what kind of Change happens to them. Now this supposes on one hand that they are still Bread and Wine, and on the other, that we must not proceed so far as to a change of Substance.

P. 246.

MR. Arnaud then advertises the World to no purpose, That these kind of Writings are design'd to represent the General, Publick, and Universal Sentiments of the Church, and not the Particular Sentiment of Authors. That they contain an Exact, Precise, and Plain way of Speaking without Figure, or Metaphor, their End being only to give an Exact and True Account of Points of Faith. It is easy to turn these Remarks against himself; For seeing these kind of Writings speak Precisely, and Exactly, he ought to shew us Distinctly, and Exactly the Conversion of Substances contained in them: And seeing it is not to be found in them, and yet this Profession of Faith represents the General, Publick, and Universal Sentiment of the Greek Church; It follows that this Publick, General, and Universal Sentiment is not Transubstantiation.

P. 247.

TO little Purpose likewise does he add, That the Church would not have the Converted Sarracens believe that the Bread and Wine were not truly the Body and Blood of Christ, but only his Figure indued with their Virtue. This is not the Point; the Question is to know whether they were taught the Conversion of Substances, which is what he ought to show, but this he will be never able to

todo. For, for to teach that the Bread and Wine are really the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, ( which is what is precisely contain'd in this Profession of Faith ) is not as ( as I have already said ) the teaching the Conversion of Substances. Moreover I never told him the modern *Greeks* asserted the *Eucharist* to be a Figure : And as to the Change of Virtue we do not prove it, it is true by this Profession of Faith, but we prove it by other Testimonies, which are so plain and expressive that Mr. *Arnaud* can give no solid Answer to them.

THERE only remain now of all those pretended Proofs of Mr. *Arnaud*, some Passages out of *Cabasilas* Bishop of *Thessalonica*, *Simeon* Bishop also of *Thessalonica*, *Jeremias* the Patriarch of *Constantinople*, and some other Greek Authors. They all say near upon the same thing, which is, *That the Bread and Wine are the Body and Blood of Christ: This very Body and Blood. That they are changed into this Body and Blood.* But Mr. *Arnaud* must disabuse himself once for all, touching the Thoughts he has, that from these kind of Expressions may be concluded the Doctrine of the Conversion of Substances: For so far are we from granting this Conclusion to be good, that we pretend we have Reason to draw a contrary Consequence. In effect. 1<sup>st</sup>. There is nothing more usual in Authors than to say, *That the Poor are Jesus Christ, even Christ himself, that the Church is the Body of Jesus Christ, the very Body of Jesus Christ, that we are changed into Jesus Christ, changed into his Body, transformed into him, changed into his Flesh*: and such like ways of speaking, Examples of which are infinite. It is then a great Abuse to pretend these Terms are to be understood in a Sence of Identity and substantial Conversion, as they term it. For ( as I said elsewhere, ) these Expressions being lyable to be Expounded in divers particular Sences, and seeing they may be taken in a general and indistinct one, there can be no Reason for the taking them, in the Sence which Mr. *Arnaud* gives them.

II. THE Conversion of the Substances of Bread and Wine into those of the Body and Blood of Christ, does of it self, form so precise and distinct a Sence, that when Authors would assert it, they explain it in clear and distinct Terms, which answer the distinct determinate Conception they have of it. Whence it follows, that if the Greek Authors had on this Subject the same Belief as the Roman Church, they would explain themselves so clearly, that there would be no need of running to the Baron of *Spartaris*, nor *Paysius Ligaridius*, nor yet to the fix Syrian Priests to make us understand it.

FOR whilst he produces no other kind of Passages but such as these, we shall have still Reason to conclude from hence, that the *Greeks* do not believe Transubstantiation, because if they did believe it, they would without doubt speak otherwise of it.

III. BUT supposing these Reasons Invalid, we have shewed ( when we treated of the real Belief of the *Greeks* ) in what Sence they understand these Expressions. In effect, if we compare the Doctrine of the *Greeks* with that of the *Latins*, and throly comprehend what they hold in common, and where-in they differ, we shall easily perceive Mr. *Arnaud*'s Sophism, for whatsoever he alledges from Greek Authors, respects this Equivocal part of their Hypothesis, which he believed to be like that of the *Latins*, altho at bottom 'tis not so; but he has studiously avoided the relating any thing concerning this other Part, by which the two Hypothesis's distinguish themselves, and vary



from one another. The *Greeks* and *Latins* agree in these general Expressions, *The Bread is made the Body of Jesus Christ, The Bread is changed into the Body of Christ, it becomes the very Body, the proper Body, the real Body of Christ. They are not two Bodies, but one Body.* So far you see they hold the same Language.

BUT go farther, ask them whether the nature of Bread ceases to be. The *Latins* answer, there remains nothing of its Substance, nor Matter, nor inward Form, but only the Accidents. The *Greeks* on the contrary say, That the Bread is joyned to the Divinity, that from this Union results one composed of two Natures, that there is made a Composition of Bread and the Holy Spirit. Ask the *Latins* how the Bread is made the Body of Jesus Christ; They Answer, by the Conversion of its whole Substance, into the Substance which this Body had before the Conversion. The *Greeks* on the contrary say, the Bread becomes an Augmentation of the natural Body of our Lord, and is made by this means his Body: Ask them what Change the Bread receives; the *Latins* say it is a real Transubstantiation, (that is to say) the change of one Substance into another. The *Greeks* on the contrary answer, that it is a Sanctification which the Bread receives, and that it is changed into the Supernatural Virtue of Christ's Body. Ask the *Latins* how the Bread becomes the real Body, the very Body, the proper Body of our Lord born of the Virgin Mary: They answer, 'tis because in effect the same numerical Substance, without any Difference. The *Greeks* on the contrary say, that 'tis because an Augmentation makes not another Body, than that which receives Augmentation, and they make use of the Example of a Child, which Eating, and Drinking and Growing by this means, has not two Bodies, but one.

MR. Arnaud then has in vain, collected all the Passages of *Cabasilas* which assert, *The Gifts are changed into the Body and Blood of Christ, that the Bread is the very Body of our Saviour, the Sacrifice offered for the Salvation of the World, that the Lord is seen and handled by means of the Holy and Dreadful Mysteries, and that we receive him in the Eucharist.* These Expressions are common both to the *Latins* and *Greeks*, from whence he can conclude nothing, to the Prejudice of these Differences we have observed, and which decide the Question.

IT is in vain he tells us, that *Cabasilas* Disputing against the *Latins*, on the Subject of this Prayer which they make after the Consecration: *Jube sursum ferri dona hæc in manu angeli ad supercæleste tuum Altare: Reasons on these four Principles which include the real Presence, and Transubstantiation.* 1<sup>st</sup>. That we ought not to wish the Body of Christ be taken up from us. 2<sup>ly</sup>. That the Body of Christ being in Heaven and on Earth, we ought not to desire it should be carried up into Heaven, because it is there already. 3<sup>dly</sup>. That it cannot be offered by Angels, because it is above Angels. 4<sup>ly</sup>. That we cannot without Impiety wish the Gifts a greater Dignity, seeing they are the Body of Jesus Christ.

AS to what concerns the first of these: *Cabasilas* say's only, *We must not pray that the Holy Gifts be taken away from us, but on the contrary, that they may remain with us, and must believe they do so, because it is thus that Christ is with us to the end of the World:* Hitherto we see neither Transubstantiation, nor real Presence. As to the 2<sup>d</sup>. *Cabasilas* say's, *That if the Latins acknowledged it to be the Body of Christ, they must believe he is with us, and that he is above the Heavens, seated at the right Hand of the Father, in a manner known to him, which still supposes neither real Presence, nor Transubstantiation.* For according

cording to the *Greeks*, the *Eucharist* which is on the Earth, being the Growth of the Body of Christ, is one and the same Body with that in Heaven. So that in this manner, the same Body is in Heaven and on Earth; In Heaven, in respect of its natural Substance, and on Earth, in respect of the Mystery, which is its Growth; which is far from the Sence of the *Latins*; and does not suppose any Transubstantiation. As to the 3d. How, say's *Cabasilas*, can that be carried up by an Angel which is above all Principalities and Powers, and above every Name. But, methinks this would be to extend the use of Consequences too far, to conclude from hence that the *Eucharist* is the Body of Christ in propriety of Substance. For it is sufficient to establish the Truth of what *Cabasilas* say's, that the Bread is the Body of Christ in Virtue, and by way of Growth, as we have already observed the *Greeks* explain it, seeing it is true that this Dignity raises it up in some Sence above the Angels themselves, not in respect of its Nature or Substance, but in respect of the Virtue which accompanies it, which is the supernatural Virtue of our Lord's Body. As to the 4th. It is certain that *Cabasilas* has had reason to say that if the *Latins* desired the Gifts might after their Consecration receive some new Dignity, and a Change into a better State, their Prayer would be impious, seeing they acknowledged they were already the Body of Christ. For, as he afterwards adds, to what more excellent or Holy State can we believe they pass into? His Reasoning is good, but I do not see it includes (as Mr. *Arnaud* tells us) the real Presence, and Transubstantiation: He ought to shew us this, and not assert it without Proof; for it may very well be said in the Sence of the *Greeks*, that the Bread is capable of no higher a Dignity, than that of receiving the Impression of the Virtue of Christ's Body, and to be made this Body by way of Growth and Augmentation.

IT is moreover in Vain Mr. *Arnaud* endeavours to shew that in the Sence of *Cabasilas* Christ does not really dye in the *Eucharist*, for we never imputed to this Author so strange a Doctrine: Neither have we been deceiv'd touching the Participles *σφαγν* & *σφαθόμενον* as Mr. *Arnaud* has imagined. For we find that *Cabasilas* calls the Body of Christ not *σφαγν* as Mr. *Arnaud* supposes, this is a Fault in Grammar which has scaped his Pen for want of heed, and which we must not impute to a Greek; but *σφαγν*, we have seen likewise he deny's the Body is, not *σφαθόμενον* as Mr. *Arnaud* does, again assert by a Mistake thro Incogitancy, for we are not willing to attribute it to any thing else. The *Greeks* do not say *πῶμα σφαθόμενον* in that Sence, to say the Sacrificed or Slain Body, no more than *πῶμα σφαγν*; but *σφαθόμενον*, which is to say that *Cabasilas* means that the Body has been slain heretofore, and not at present. But this does not hinder it from being true, as I said in my Answer to the *Perpetuity*, that *Cabasilas* has respect to the Body of Christ in the *Eucharist*, as dead, that is to say under a respect or quality of Death. Which appears by what he say's, that it is not an Image or Representation of a Sacrifice, but a real Sacrifice, not of Bread, but of the Body of Christ, and that there is but one Sacrifice of the Lamb, of him which was once offered. Whence it follows that Christ is in the *Eucharist* as Dead, and Sacrificed on the Cross, which is precisely what I said.

Lib. 3. c. 8.

Answer to the  
2d Treat. c. 8.Cabasil. expos.  
Lit. cap. 32.

MR. *Arnaud* will say that the Consequence which I draw, to wit, that Christ is not substantially present in the *Eucharist*, is contrary to *Cabasilas* his Discourse, who assures us, That the Bread is changed into the thing Sacrificed, altho the Sacrifice is not presently offered; But Mr. *Arnaud* having never well comprehended the Hypothesis of the *Greeks*, it is no marvel if he has misun-

Ibid.

derstood *Cabasilas* his Sence in this Discourse which he makes of the Sacrifice in his thirty second Chapter. The *Greeks* will have the Bread pass thro all the Degrees of the *Oeconomy*, thro which the Body of Christ has passed, that as the Holy Spirit came upon the Substance of the Holy Virgin, so does he come upon the Bread; that as the Body of Christ was in a corruptible state, Crucifi'd, and Buried; so in like manner the Bread is first Corruptible, lifted up as it were upon a Cross, and buried in our Bodies, as in a Sepulchre. That, in fine, it becomes incorruptible as the Body of Christ was after his Resurrection: which they establish by this Reason, that the Bread is an augmentation of the Body of Jesus Christ; and that as Nature observes on the Food which nourishes us, and augments our Body, the same order she kept in the first matter from which we were formed. So Grace observes in the Eucharistical Bread, the same order she observes in the Natural Body. By this means they will have the Bread become first the Body of Christ, inasmuch as 'tis Mortal and Corruptible, that it be afterwards this dead Body; and in fine, this Incorruptible and Raised Body. *Cabasilas* his Sence then is, that when the Bread is mystically sacrificed, it is made the dead Body of Jesus Christ, as he speaks himself, *the Lamb slain*, not that the Body suffers Death in this Moment, but because in this Moment the Bread passes thro the *Oeconomy* of Death. And thus the Bread is changed into the dead Body of our Lord, not that our Saviour dyes in effect, but because the Bread which is the Growth of his Body, is then changed into this Body, in as much as it suffered Death heretofore. And this is *Cabasilas* his real Sence, which is conformable to the Hypothesis of the *Greeks*, and not that which Mr. *Arnaud* attributes to him.

HE likewise uses to no purpose several Passages out of *Simeon of Thessalonica*. They say nothing but what I already often answered, to wit, *That the Bread is the real Body of Jesus Christ, that it is the very Body of Christ*, and I shewed in what Sence the *Greeks* use these Expressions, and therefore will not any more repeat it. I likewise answered what he alledged touching the Adoration and the unconsecrated Particles.

Lib. 4. c. 4.

AS to *Feremias* the Patriarch of *Constantinople*, we may well wonder that he should so confidently offer him us as a Person that teaches Transubstantiation, seeing that not only *Feremias* holds the same Language as the others, but asserts several things which opposes the Roman Doctrine. Mr. *Arnaud* having according to his Custom impertinently related several historical Passages, tells us, *That the Article of the Ausbourg Confession, which respects the Sacrament, expressly asserting the real Presence, but not mentioning Transubstantiation; Jeremias answers, that Point is handled in it very briefly and obscurely, and adds, that the Catholick Church holds the Bread is changed into the very Body and Blood of our Lord thro the Holy Spirit.* So that then *Feremias* held Transubstantiation: And thus does Mr. *Arnaud* draw his Consequences; But he is too quick. Some Protestants in *Germany* sent the *Ausbourg* Confession to the Patriarch of *Constantinople* without any Commentary or Exposition on it. The Patriarch examining its tenth Article, which runs thus, *Touching the Lord's Supper, they hold the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ are really present in it, and are distributed to those that participate thereof, and condemn the Opinion of those that hold the contrary: He say's, This Article treats of the Lord's Supper very briefly, and to say the Truth, somewhat obscurely; For, adds he, we are told several things of you which we do not approve.* To say hereupon that the *Lutherans* understood this Article in the Sence of the real Presence, and that the *Greeks* could not be ignorant of it, signifies nothing. For it appears that the



the Patriarch only considered the Expressions of the Article barely as they are laid down, and found them obscure. And as to those things which were told him of them on this Subject, and which he disapproved, he does not specify them. When then he adds, *That the Catholick Church holds, the Bread is changed into the Body and Blood of our Lord thro the Spirit.* It is clear his Design is without proceeding any farther into the Examination of their Belief, to tell them that of his Church, and oppose it against their Article, so that we must always return to the Inquiry whether by these Expressions, *The Bread is changed into the real Body*, he means Transubstantiation, or the other Change by way of Augmentation, and Impression of Virtue; for 'tis certain, the Article of the *Ausbourg* Confession respects neither of these Changes.

MR. Arnaud tells us, *This was a proper place wherein to assert the Body and Blood of Christ are not really present in the Sacrament, seeing only their Virtue is in it.* Ibid. p. 361. Answer, a presence of Virtue, is a real Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ. even as the Sun is really present with us by the Efficacy of its Beams, so that *Jeremias* had no reason to oppose the reality of the Presence; but 'twas better said by him, that the Terms of the Confession were Ambiguous, and that they ought to acknowledg clearly, the Body and Blood are substantially present in it, supposing he believed this substantial Presence.

MR. Arnaud adds, *That the Patriarch does not say the Bread is changed in p. 362. Virtue, Power and Efficacy.* Answer, neither does he say 'tis changed in Substance, and there is this Difference betwixt Mr. Arnaud and I, that I add it was not necessary that *Jeremias* should explain himself touching this change of Virtue, because the *Greeks* who preceded him, had already plainly done it; but the same cannot be said touching the change of Substance, for not one of the *Greeks* ever mentioned it any more than he, so that he was necessarily obliged clearly to express it, if he intended it should be understood.

BUT Mr. Arnaud further say's, *The Divines of Wittemberg, and Tubinga, believed upon the Answer of the Patriarch, that he taught the real Presence and Transubstantiation.* p. 370. When this were true we need not be astonished thereat: For it might well be that Divines who held the Consubstantiation should take the Words of *Jeremias* in a Sence which opposed only one part of their Opinion, rather than in another which would wholly overthrow it. Their Prejudication signifies nothing, to the Exposition which the *Greeks* make themselves of their own Opinion.

BUT Mr. Arnaud say's moreover, *If the Divines of Wittemberg Misunderstood the Patriarch's Sence, it lay upon him to rectify their Mistakes.* I answer, there cannot be any Advantage made of *Jeremias's* Silence in this Respect. For it is certain that in these Divines first answer, they reckon amongst the Points in which they agreed with the Patriarch, this, *That the Communion, or Supper of our Lord, unites us to him, in as much as we truly partake therein of his Flesh and Blood:* But these were the proper Expressions which this Patriarch used, and so far there was no reason to say they charged him with believing what he did not, seeing they only repeated what he said. It is likewise true they denied the Bread was changed therein, which they grounded on the Testimony of St. Paul, who calls it Bread; yet did they make use of the same Term *Jeremias* did, which is that of μεταβάλλειν, without the

the least mention of a change of Substance. So that so far *Jeremias* had no cause to tell 'em they mistook his Words: Neither does he do it in his Reply or second Answer, but still continues to say, *The Bread is changed*, without proceeding any farther. It is true, in fine, that the Divines having replied to *Jeremias* his second Letter, they expressly oppose the change of Substance, and seem thereby to suppose they had taken the μεταβάλλεσθαι of *Jeremias* in the Sence of a real Transubstantiation, which might then oblige this Patriarch to explain himself more clearly than he had done in his former Writings. But it is also true that he returned them no particular Answer touching the Article of the *Eucharist*. He contented himself with telling them in general concerning the Sacraments, *That seeing they admitted only some of them, and moreover erroneously perverted and changed the Expressions of the ancient and modern Doctrin to obtain their Aim*, διασέφοντες καὶ μεταβάλλοντες τὰ ἢ παλαιῶς καὶ νέῃ διδασκαλίᾳ ἑστῶτα, *They therefore deserved not the Title of Divines*. Which sufficiently shews his Complaint against them, for their misunderstanding of these Terms, in understanding them of a change of Substance, and at the same time certifying them, that for his Part he would not deviate from the general and usual Expressions of his Church.

IT is certain there is in these Writings of *Jeremias*, such Matters which cannot agree with the Roman Transubstantiation, as that which we have already related when we treated on the real Belief of the Greeks, *That God has given us the Sacraments double, that is to say, consisting on one Hand of the Grace of the Holy Spirit, and on the other, of sensible things, which are Water, Oyl, Bread, and the Chalice by which our Souls are sanctified*; For a Man that speaks thus, clearly shews he understands the Substance of Bread remains. We may likewise reckon in this Rank what he says concerning the Church, *That she is set forth to us in the Mysteries, not as in the Symbols*; But as the Members are in the Heart, and the Branches of a Tree in the Root, or as the Branches in the Vine according to our Saviour's Words. For here is not only a bare Communion of Name, or relation of Resemblance, but the Identity of the thing it self: For the Mysteries are really the Body and Blood of Christ, and they are not changed into our Body, but we are changed into them, the strongest part prevailing. The Iron when put in the Fire, becomes Fire it self, but the Fire becomes not Iron. As then when the Iron is red-hot, we perceive no more Iron, but Fire, the Fire dispelling all the Proprieties of Iron, so he that beholds Christ's Church, in as much as it is united to him, and partakes of his Flesh, beholds nothing else but the Body of our Lord.

THIS Discourse is taken *Verbatim* out of *Cabasilas*, as I have observed elsewhere, and shews the Change of Bread and Wine, must not be urged as if they understood it of a Change of Substance, seeing he uses the same Term in respect of the Communicants, saying, *We are changed into the Mysteries*. They likewise shew us we must not take in a Counter-Sence what he say's concerning the Mysteries, being really the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, seeing he tells us the Church is the very Body of our Lord. I alledged these last Words in my Answer to the Perpetuity, and say'd, *That Jeremias speaks of the Church which has received the Impression of the Spirit of Christ*. Mr. Arnaud accuses me of Falsifying this Passage: But this Accusation comes from his being out of Humor. The original Words I recited are these οὐδὲν ἑτερον ἢ αὐτὸ μόνον τὸ κυριανὸν ὁφεται ὧμα, *he will perceive nothing else but our Lord's Body*: And as to what I said, that he speaks of the Church which has received the Impression of the Spirit of Christ, I affirm this is his Sence, and that Mr. Arnaud

(as

(as prejudiced as he is) cannot give it any other: For to what relates this Comparison of Fire which changes the Iron, but to the Impression of the Spirit of Christ on the Church, and this Union of the Church with Christ, but to his spiritual and mystical Union? It is true he say's, *That 'tis in as much as she is partaker of his Flesh*: But this does not in any sort change his Sence. For 'tis from the mystical Participation of his Flesh that comes the Impression of his Spirit, and it is the Impression of his Spirit which effects this admirable Change. These two things are subalternate, but not contrary to one another: So that Mr. *Arnaud* impertinently charges me with falsifying the Passage of *Jeremias*. But it is not the same with this other Passage which *Forbesius* alledged, and concerning which I have complained of the Author of the *Perpetuity*. Mr. *Arnaud* may say if he pleases, *That my Complaint is unreasonable*; yet will it be found both Just and Reasonable. *Forbesius* was a Person who making outward Profession of the Protestant Religion, yet wrote in favour of the Church of *Rome*, under the specious pretence of Peace and Agreement. To soften what we believe is hard in the Doctrine of Transubstantiation, he assures us that almost all the *Greeks* believe it, and instances *Jeremias* who teaches according to what he say's, *That the Bread is neither a Figure, nor an Azyme, but the real Body of Christ contained under the species of leavened Bread.*

The Author of the *Perpetuity* alleges this *Forbesius* as a Person whose Testimony ought to be of great weight with us, being a Protestant. The cause then of my Complaint is, that we must have a false Translation of *Jeremias* imposed upon us, under the Name of a Protestant, without telling us what kind of Man this Protestant was. When we make use of a Witness, we ought certainly to consider what he is, and if it appears there be just Exceptions against him, we must not offer him; and when we would use a Passage which he alleges, we must take care his Translation be true. It is to no purpose to say, *We are not obliged to justify the Translations of Protestants, and that if* P. 365. *be be mistaken 'tis his Fault*. This might be indeed alledged, supposing the Author of the *Perpetuity* had disputed against *Forbesius*, or were ignorant who this *Forbesius* was; but this Mans Character sufficiently shews it self by the bare reading of his Book. Neither does it signify any thing to say, *That Forbesius is not the Author of this Translation, but Transcribed it Verbatim from Socolovius*. Neither is it less a Deceit in *Forbesius* himself, who ought not to make us Believe that *Jeremias* said what he did not, and when a Person that pretends to be of our Communion deceives us, we have right to inveigh against him. Let us come then to the Point, and inquire whether the Translation of *Jeremias* be false. Mr. *Arnaud* say's 'tis not, and I affirm it is: The Question will be decided by the reading of *Jeremias* his own Words. *The Bread*, say's he, *of the Lord's Body, which is administred by the Priests, is neither a Type, nor an Azyme, but it is ἐνζυμων καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ ὅλον καὶ τὸ ἅλλον, a leavened Loaf, and the very Body of our Lord, and the Translation runs, Illud ipsum verum Christi corpus, sub speciebus fermentati panis contentum, The Body it self, the real Body of Christ CONTAINED UNDER THE SPECIES OF LEAVENED BREAD.* Mr. *Arnaud* affirms that this is not a Falsification, because *Jeremias* his true Sence is represented in it. For say's he, these Words, ἐνζυμων καὶ αὐτὸ ὅλον καὶ τὸ ἅλλον, are capable of two different P. 366. Sences. First, This Bread is called ἐνζυμων *Leavened, because it remains in effect leavened Bread, and that it is only the Body of Christ, in Figure or Virtue.* Secondly, It is called by this Name of leavened Bread, because it was originally leavened Bread, and does still appear so, altho it be the Body of our Lord. But the first



first of these Sences has been several times excluded by *Jeremias* his own Words, wherein he clearly asserted that after the Consecration the leavened Bread is changed into our Lord's real Body, that it is not a Figure, but our Lord's Body, that it is this Flesh concerning which he speaks; The Bread which I shall give you is my Flesh. It is excluded in what follows sundry different ways, and by the very Words of that passage which asserts it is our Lord's Body. Whence it follows it is not then really leavened Bread.

I answer, that this pretended Sence which Mr. *Arnaud* attributes to *Jeremias* is precisely the Point in Question. Now whilst a matter is in Dispute, we must never translate a Passage according to the Sence of one of the Parties which th'other denies him. To deal sincerely, the proper and natural Signification of Terms must be kept, and every man left at his liberty to judge of them. For when men translate according to the Pretention of one Party, they are no longer the Words of this Author, but the Prejudication of this Party, and consequently an Alteration, even when the Prejudication of this Party should be just and reasonable in the Main. Moreover Mr. *Arnaud* is mistaken, if he believes the other Passages of *Jeremias* determine a Sence of substantial Reality, for according to the Hypothesis of the Greeks, the Bread still remains Bread in Substance, altho it be changed into the Body of Christ, and be the very Body of Christ, and not a Figure, as we have often already declared, whence it follows the Translation in question cannot be justified.

A Man of never so mean Capacity may perceive that *Jeremias* his Sence, is not that which Mr. *Arnaud* attributes to him. For in the same place where he say's, *The Bread is changed into the real Body of Christ, and the Wine into his Blood*, and wherein he alledges the Words of Christ which tell us, not, *This is an Azyme, or this is the Figure of my Body, but this is my Body*; He adds by way of Explication, *This is not to say that the Flesh which our Saviour then had, was given to be eaten by his Disciples, nor his Blood to be drunk, nor that now in this sacred Ordinance our Lord's Body descends from Heaven: This would be Blasphemy. But then and now by Prayers and the Grace of the almighty Spirit, which operates in the Mysteries by means of the Holy Orisons, the Bread is changed into our Lord's real Body and Blood.* These Words being applyed to the Hypothesis of the Greeks, that the Bread remaining Bread, and receiving the Impression of the Holy Spirit, is changed into the Body of Christ by way of Augmentation, are clear, and void of Difficulty. But if we apply them to the Hypothesis of the Latins, who affirm the Substance of Bread is changed into the natural Flesh of Christ, and becomes the Same numerical Flesh which our Lord had when on Earth; In what Sence shall we understand that saying of *Jeremias*, namely that the Flesh which Christ had then, was not given to be eaten by his Disciples? For if we grant Transubstantiation, it is certain the Disciples eat the same Flesh which Christ then had, and *Jeremias* his Proposition can not subsist. Mr. *Arnaud* endeavours but in vain, to expound *Jeremias* his Discourse in saying, *That Christ gave not to be eaten by his Disciples the Flesh which he had, in ceasing to have it, and to appear before them in his usual manner, in cutting his Body into Morsels, or having no other place of Abode than his Apostles Stomach.* To make us receive this Gloss, it must be grounded on *Jeremias* his own Words, and not on Mr. *Arnaud*'s Imagination. These Corrections and fine Explications hinder not, but that the Patriarch's Proposition is absolute and contrary to the Doctrine of Transubstantiation. For that which *Jeremias* denies, is not that our Saviour disappeared before his Disciples, nor cut his Flesh into Morsels, but that he gave them to eat the

the Flesh he then had. The Question respects not the manner in which our Lord gave his Flesh to be eaten, but whether he did give it, and *Jeremias* asserts he did not. What likelihood is there that a Man who believes Transubstantiation, would thus roughly offer a Negative which is directly opposite to his Belief? What likelihood is there he would offer it in the same place and Discourse wherein he asserts Transubstantiation, without explaining, and lessening the Offence, which might be taken at his Words? But in short, how is it probable he would treat as Blasphemous the Proposition contrary to his Negative? Of these two Propositions, *Christ gave to be eaten by his Disciples the Flesh he bore, and Christ gave not the Flesh he bare to his Disciples to eat.* The first would be the only true one according to the Letter, without Gloss and Commentary, supposing Transubstantiation. Th'other taken literally would be false and heretical, and to make it tolerable, it must have Expositions and Molifications contrary to what the Letter bears. Mr. *Arnaud* is forced to change the first and natural Sense of the Terms, and impose on them a forced and unusual one. Who can then imagine that a Man who believed Transubstantiation, or the real Presence, and positively asserted it, should be so senseless as to condemn the first of these Propositions which expressly contains his Belief, to condemn it I say as Blasphemous, and establish the second as the only true one, without using any Corrective or Illustration? This is wholly improbable.

AND this is what I had to say concerning *Jeremias*. There remains nothing more of all Mr. *Arnaud's* pretended Proofs, than the Passages taken out of some common Authors, wherein there being nothing extraordinary, and containing only that the Bread is the Body of Christ, and that it is changed into his Body: The same Answer being applied to them will be sufficient.

## CHAP. IX.

*Several Passages of Anastasius Sinaites, Germane the Patriarch of Constantinople, and Damascene, Examined.*

HAVING satisfied Mr. *Arnaud's* Objections concerning the *Greeks* since the eleventh Century to this present, we must not any longer defer the Consideration of his seventh Book, wherein by an odd kind of Humour he ascends upwards to the seventh Century, and so descends down again inclusively to the tenth. I call this an odd and proposterous way of proceeding; For why, begin at the eleventh Century, seeing he designed to treat of the seventh and following Ages? Why skip over the first and six Centuries, if he sincerely design'd to prove the *Perpetuity* of the Doctrines of Transubstantiation and the real Presence? The Question being to know whether these Doctrines were ever believed and taught in the Christian Church, and especially in *Greece*, there is no other direct way than that of taking Tradition from the Source, and to pass on from the first Century to the second, from the second to the third, and so on

to the last. If he thought this Method tedious, he would have done better to have abridged it in shewing these Doctrines were taught in the first six Centuries, and suppose the same in those that followed, than to shew them established from the eleventh and seventh, whereby to suppose the same in the six foregoing Centuries. To speak sincerely there ought to be neither of these Suppositions made; for it does not absolutely follow from a Point's being held in the first Ages, that it has been likewise held in the last, neither does it any more follow from a Point's being held in the last, that it was so in the first. This does not follow in respect of Fact: Yet it is certain that in respect of Right, which is far more considerable than Fact, 'tis more advantageous to shew a Doctrine in the beginnings of Tradition, than in the sequels of it. For it rather follows from a Doctrine's being held in the beginnings of Tradition, that it ought to be held still, than it does follow from its being held at present, or since the eleventh, or seventh Century, that it ought to be held, or that it was held in effect in the first Ages of the Church. Why then has Mr. *Arnaud* divided his Tradition into three parts; one since the eleventh Century, to this present, th'other since the seventh to the tenth, and the third, from the first Century to the sixth, seeing Tradition ought to be taken successively in order? Why has he in his Division made the last part the first, seeing in effect it is the last in order? Why in short, thus injure his Cause in spending all his time upon the two least important, and which signify nothing, as to the main of our Question, and remit the most important to another time, when his Conveniency will serve him to consider them? Howsoever we purpose to follow him every where, and therefore shall examine here his seventh Book, because it treats still of the Belief of the *Greeks*; For by this means the Readers will see in order whatsoever Mr. *Arnaud* has alledged in relation to this Church.

THE Publick having nothing to do with our personal Quarrels, and the Cause which I defend, depending neither on what I am, or am not, I shall therefore pass by all the Invectives with which the first Chapter is filled. The first thing which appears in it is my Picture, which cannot but be well done, coming from his Hands; for persons Characters are the chief Weapons Mr. *Arnaud* and his Friends use in their Disputes. But he may describe me how he pleases, for I shall not be much moved thereat. Those that read our Discourses, will do us both right I hope. I shall only say then that Mr. *Arnaud* has captiously abused my Words touching the eight first Centuries when I called them, *The Churches happy Days, peaceable and blessed Days, wherein the Pastors took care to instruct their Flocks, and remove all the Difficulties which might arise from the Sacrament's being commonly called the Body of Christ.* 1<sup>st</sup>. I joyned all these Centuries together, when I spake of them in this sort, and Mr. *Arnaud* only considers the two last of them, taking no notice of the other six, as if what I said of these two last were to be taken alone and apart. 2<sup>dly</sup>. That altho the two last are comprehended amongst the number of the eight, yet I never meant that the Title of *happy Days, Days of Peace and Blessing*, belongs equally to all of them. The happy Days have an end, and altho their last Hours which draw nearest to Night, are darker than those which preceded them, yet are we wont to comprehend them amongst the rest, under the Name of *happy Day*, because when we distribute the Sense of these kind of Expressions to all the Parts, or Hours; rational Persons make this Distribution proportionably to what each of them deserves. May not that Person be justly derided for his Impertinency that carps at the calling of a *happy Day* a time wherein there's scarcely any longer Light, under pretence that the last Hour, which

Answer to the  
2<sup>d</sup>. Treat.  
2, p. c. 3.



which approaches nearer the Night, is darker than the rest. Now this Mr. Arnaud exactly does, he pretends 'tis impertinently that I call the eight first Centuries, *The Churches happy Days*, seeing the other Ministers assert the seventh and eighth, that is to say, the two last were Ages of Ignorance and Superstition. To dissipate all these Subtilties, we need but distinguish these Centuries in two respects, in which we may consider them, either by comparing them with the preceeding, or following Ages. In the first they were Ages of Ignorance, and Superstition. And in the second, they were the last Hours of the Churches happy Days, or the approaches of a Night, that is to say in one Word, that altho Knowledge and Zeal suffered very much Diminution in them, and several Errors troubled the Purity of Religion, yet this was nothing in comparison of what followed afterwards. This is the Judgment I think we ought to make of them in general. But in particular, in respect of the Mystery of the Eucharist, I firmly believe that the Doctrine of the real Presence and Transubstantiation, were not then established in the Church during these two Centuries; we may indeed meet with some hard Expressions, and such as are contrary to those of the preceeding Ages, but no substantial Conversion. We shall find the care of instructing the People in the sound Knowledge of the Sacrament greatly slackned in comparison of the preceeding Ages, yet were they not wholly ignorant how the *Eucharist* is the Body of Christ; to wit, in that it is the Sacrament or Mystery of it. It was in this Sense I understood the seventh and eighth Centuries were comprehended amongst the Churches happy Days. Let any Man judg now what Reason Mr. Arnaud has to represent me as a Person, *That never respects things as they are in Effect, but only as I would have them, that has no regard to Truth, nor Probability, but only the advantaging of my Cause, that disposes of Historical Passages and real Events with more liberty than Adventures are dealt out in Romances, that builds Castles in the Air, and makes all Men in the World Senseless, provided they speak and think according to my Desires and Pretensions, that prefers the smallest Reasons, before the strongest and clearest Proofs; and proposes all this in a confident insulting manner, giving myself those Applauses which I would willingly receive from others, and treating my Adversaries with Contempt and Disdain.* And here is the Tempest which has followed my Sun-shine, my happy Days. But I am sorry Mr. Arnaud should be thus angry upon no occasion: Howsoever we will Examine the Passages he has offered.

THE first is a Passage taken out of *Anastatius Sinaite*, wherein a Monk argues against Hereticks who asserted Christ's Body was incorruptible before his Resurrection. To prove that it was Corruptible, he takes it for granted by his Adversaries, *That the Eucharist is really the true Body and Blood of Christ, not mere Bread, such as is sold in the Market; nor a Figure, such as was the Sacrifice of the paschal Lamb amongst the Jews.* To this Principle he adds another, which is, *That the Eucharist is corruptible, as Experience shews us; and from these two Propositions he concludes, That the Body of Christ was Corruptible before his Resurrection.* Every Man sees this Reasoning is grounded on this Supposition, *That the Eucharist is the Body of Christ, such as it was before his Resurrection,* that is to say in the same State. Now it is likewise manifest that this Supposition is wholly inconsistent with the Doctrine of Transubstantiation, and that of the substantial Presence. For besides that, 'tis both foolish and impious to imagine that our Lord's Body which is risen out of its State of Humiliation descends into it again, and exists still Mortal, Corruptible and Passible, as it was heretofore: This is moreover directly contrary to his Sacramental State, wherein we must necessarily suppose it, if we

would have it to be in the *Eucharist* in proper Substance. For it is not to be imagined that a Body which exists after the manner of a Spirit impalpable and indivisible, which can be neither seen nor touched, should be at the same time Mortal, Corruptible, and Passible, as our Saviour's Body was before his Resurrection: These two States are inconsistent with each other; whence it follows that whatsoever otherwise the Sense of this Author might be, he held neither Transubstantiation, nor the Reality which the Church of *Rome* holds.

YET if we believe Mr. *Arnaud* he is a Witness for him. For as soon as ever he finds in any Passage that the *Eucharist* is not a Figure, but the true Body of Christ, he requires no more for the making of a Proof, altho he sees otherwise several things absolutely contrary to him. One of the usual Artifices with which he imposes on his Readers; is, that when he offers any Passage importing what I now mentioned, or something like it, he sets himself to shew not that 'tis the *Romane* Transubstantiation therein contained, but that 'tis not our Doctrine. And thus has he done in that Passage of *Anastasius's*,  
*Ibid. p. 625.* Can any Man, say's he, that has but the least spark of Sense, and believes the *Eucharist* to be only a Figure of Christ's Body, and not the real Body of Christ, Express this his Opinion by these Terms. The *Eucharist* is not the Figure, but really the true Body of Christ. Can any Calvinist in the World refuse to acknowledge this Discourse overthrows his Doctrine? And I say, can there be any Man that has but the least dram of Sense, that believes the Body of Christ exists in the *Eucharist* after the manner of a Spirit, and is therein in a Sacramental State, and yet expresses this his Belief in saying the *Eucharist* is subject to Corruption; and concluding from thence that the Body of Christ was then Corruptible before his Resurrection? Is there ever a one of Mr. *Arnaud's* Friends that can contain himself from believing this Discourse overthrows his Doctrine? When I speak in this manner, I keep to the State of our Question, and deceive no body; But when Mr. *Arnaud* speaks as he does, he wanders from the Point in hand, and deludes his Readers.

WHATSOEVER *Anastasius* his Doctrine may be, 'tis certain 'tis not that of the Church of *Rome*, which cannot consist with the Principle on which *Anastasius* argues. He expresses himself, say's Mr. *Arnaud*, a little crabbedly towards the end of his Discourse, in making use of weak Arguments, not only here, but in almost all parts of his whole Discourse. But if Mr. *Arnaud* be forced to confess that this man's Expressions are of hard digestion, when applyed to the Hypothesis of *Rome*; Why may not I as well say they are so, being applyed to our Hypothesis, and consequently they must not be urged against us? If *Anastasius* could not carefully consider the Consequence he drew himself, how could he foresee that which Mr. *Arnaud* would one Day draw from his Discourse? If it be usual with *Anastasius* to argue weakly, why may it not also be usual with him to Discourse with little foresight? Why must Advantage be taken from some of his Expressions against us, and we withheld from taking any against Mr. *Arnaud*, from the whole Sequel of his Discourse, and Coherence of his Thoughts, which a Man more minds than his Terms, or manner of expressing himself?

MR. *Arnaud* endeavours, but all in vain, to mollify *Anastasius's* Sense, in  
*Ibid. p. 637.* saying, That he concludes the Body of Christ was corruptible before his Passion, seeing he suffers still in the *Eucharist* an apparent Corruption, by the sensible Corruption of the Species, which are the Symbol of the State wherein he was before  
his

his Death. This Arguing, adds he, is very weak and roughly Expressed; but 'tis no unusual thing for this Author to Reason weakly, and it would be but a bad Consequence to conclude that an Argument is not his, because 'tis weak. It is sufficient that it be not extravagant in the highest Degree, as is that which Aubertin attributes to him.

ANASTASIUS his Argument according to Mr. Arnaud, must be put in this Form. The Body of Christ before his Resurrection was such, as is in the Eucharist, the Symbol of the State wherein he was before his Death; But this Symbol is corruptible: Therefore the Body of Christ was then Corruptible. This Argument is like that which Mr. Aubertin imputes to him according to Mr. Arnaud. *That which happens to the Figure of Christ's Body, happened to his Body before his Passion. Now it happens to the Bread which is the Figure of it, to be subject to Corruption: The Body then of Jesus Christ was Corruptible before his Passion.* Take the Word Figure from this Argument, insert that of Symbol, which Mr. Arnaud has used in his, and the two Arguments are the same. Yet he will have his to be good, and Mr. Aubertin's ridiculously Extravagant.

BUT, it will be perhaps replied, these two Arguments which in respect of Terms are alike, yet do differ in Sense; For Mr. Arnaud by the Symbol, means the Accidents or Species which cover the Body, and Mr. Aubertin by the Figure understands a real Substance of Bread. So that howsoever alike these Arguments do at first appear, one of 'em may be reasonable, and th'other Extravagant. I grant all this; but I say if Mr. Arnaud's Argument be good, Mr. Aubertin's is so likewise, and that if there be any Extravagancy in either of them, it must be in the first, and not in the second. Why must Anastasius rather argue on the State of the corruptible Species, than on that of the corruptible Bread? His Arguing, take we it how we will, must be grounded on two Qualities attributed to the Eucharist, one, *That it is a Sign*, and th'other, *That it is a corruptible Sign*, and from hence he will conclude that Christ's Body before his Resurrection was Corruptible as well as its Sign. Now these two Qualities of *Sign* and *Corruptible*, are found as well, or rather better in the Bread which Aubertin means, than in the Accidents, or Mr. Arnaud's Species. It will no ways avail to say that Anastasius denies the Eucharist to be a Figure, and that thus he would contradict himself, saying on one hand that it is not a Figure, and supposing on the other that it is one. This I say signifies nothing, for 'tis only changing the Term of Figure, into that of Symbol, which Mr. Arnaud uses, and which he believed not to be comprehended in the Rejection of the Word Figure. Neither signifies it any thing to say Anastasius assures us the Eucharist is the real Body, which hinders us from understanding by the Term of Symbol, contained in his Argument, that 'tis Bread in Substance. For I deny that by the true Body he mentions, we must understand the Body in proper Substance. It is then certain that if we may attribute Mr. Arnaud's Argument to this Author, we may as well attribute to him that of Mr. Aubertin.

BUT I say moreover, that if there be any Extravagancy in either of these two Arguments, it will be found to be rather in that which Mr. Arnaud imputes to him, than the other: Which we shall soon find if we consider what means in Anastasius his Discourse the Term of Eucharist, according to Mr. Arnaud's Commentary; for it signifies, the Incorruptible Body, Invisible and Impassible of Christ, under the Corruptible Species of Bread and Wine. Anastasi-



us then will Reason after this manner, *The Body of Christ before his Resurrection was immediately Corruptible in it self. Why? Because now in the Eucharist it is Incorruptible in it self, and Corruptible in respect of the Species which cover it.* Was ever such absurd Arguing known? Would not the Heretick *Gayanite* say the contrary hence followed; for seeing our Lord is Incorruptible in himself in the *Eucharist*, this is a Token he was so before his Resurrection. And as to the Species, being only Appearances of Bread, the Corruption which happens to them, is no more than an appearance of Corruption, which can at farthest but figure an apparent Corruption in our Lord's Body before his Resurrection; which does not differ from the Doctrine of these Hereticks. Moreover *Anastasius* establishes in his Argument this Principle, *That an incorruptible Nature can neither be Cut, nor Wounded in the Side and Hands, nor Pierced, nor put to Death, nor Eaten; That it can neither be held, nor touched.* Now is it not a most extream folly to strengthen this by instancing the *Eucharist*, that is to say the real Body of Christ which is Cut, Pierced, Chewed, in respect of the Appearances which cover it, and which are yet incorruptible. For this is just as if a Man should prove 'tis Night in pointing to the Sun shining. In effect, if we introduce the Heretick defending himself against *Anastasius* his Proposition, by the Example of the *Eucharist*, and saying, I distinguish an incorruptible Nature can neither be Hurt, nor Cut, nor Pierced, nor put to Death, immediately and really in it self: I acknowledg it, in respect of the Appearances which cover it, and I prove my Negative by the Example of the *Eucharist*, wherein the Body of Christ wholly incorruptible as it is, is yet Cut, Chewed, Pierced, in respect of the Appearances which are to it instead of a Vail. Should (I say) the Heretick be brought in Disputing against *Anastasius*'s Principle in this manner, he would make a very just and reasonable Answer, whence it appears that this Example of the *Eucharist*, if taken in the Sence Mr. *Arnaud* gives it, is an extravagancy and Folly in *Anastasius* his own Mouth.

*Ibid.* p. 631.

MR. *Arnaud* then may be pleased to acknowledg that he cannot rely on this Hypothesis, neither justify the other Evasion; which is, *That Anastasius believed this whiteness, and other sensible Accidents of the Eucharist, to be the Accidents of the Body of Christ, and so that when the Bread is broken, it is the Body of Christ that is broken.* By the Body of Christ Mr. *Arnaud* understands not the Mystical Body only, but the Natural Body in proper Substance. Now what greater Extravagancy can we charge a Man with, than to impute to him the Belief, that the Substance of the Body is in Effect, of the same Form, and Figure as the Bread in the *Eucharist*, that 'tis divided, and broken in several Particles, as the Bread is divided; that each Particle is a part of this Body, and that the Substance of this Body has really the Savour and Colour which Bread has? And seeing we must believe the Concomitancy, in the same manner as the Substance of Bread will be liquid, and fluid as Wine in the Cup, so that of the Blood will be in the other Species, hard and solid as Bread. In Truth, if *Anastasius* could have this Sentiment, we must say he was a Person unfit to be instanced in this Dispute, add Mr. *Arnaud* cannot render him more contemptible than in attributing to him such kind of Fooleries. What he alledges concerning *Tertullian*, that he believed the Divinity had a Body, is lyable to be questioned. There are abundance of Passages in this Author which will not suffer us to entertain such a Thought of him, and which oblige us to expound in a good Sence what he has otherwise expressed a little roughly. *Theodoret* makes the *Euthychiens* fall into Contradictions it is true, but they are different from the Extravagancy with which Mr. *Arnaud* charges

charges *Anastasius*, for they do not immediately discover themselves, whereas th'others presently manifest themselves. In short, if Mr. *Arnaud* cannot make use and advantage of his Authors, unless he accuse them first of Extravagancy, and afterwards excuse them by Example of the Extravagancies of others: Let me tell him, he must get better Witnesses, and not think to weary us out with the Language of Persons, who neither know what they say, nor what they believe.

WAS there ever any thing more impertinent than *Anastasius* his Argument, if what Mr. *Arnaud* imputes to him be true? He concludes that the Body of Christ was corruptible before his Resurrection (that is to say) whilst he was in the World, because it is corruptible in the *Eucharist*. Now to the end his State in the *Eucharist* may be of Consequence, to that wherein he was before his Resurrection; It follows that when he was in the World, he was in it under the Sensible Accidents of Bread, intirely such as he is in the *Eucharist*; Which is to say, that when he Talked, Walked, and Converſed, he did all these things under the form of Bread. For unless this be so, there can be no Consequence drawn from one to the other. *Anastasius* could not have denied that the incorruptible Body of Christ could not take on it a corruptible Form, seeing he knew that this Body is now incorruptible in Heaven, and that yet according to the *Hypothesis* which Mr. *Arnaud* attributes to him, it becomes every Day corruptible in the *Eucharist*, which cannot be but by changing its Form. It must needs be then that *Anastasius* supposed the Body of Christ was in the World, in the same Form 'tis now in the Sacrament, for supposing it changes its Form, I understand not the Conclusion. The Heretick *Gaynite* might still alledg, that as it does not follow this Body is corruptible in Heaven, altho it be so in the *Eucharist*, neither does it follow that it was corruptible during the time he was on Earth; and that 'tis the Form he takes upon him in the Sacrament that renders him corruptible. And thus *Anastasius* his Argument concludes nothing, unless we suppose Christ's Body had absolutely the same Form when he was conversant on Earth, that it has now in the Sacrament. Now this Supposition being the greatest Degree of Folly, (there being no Man of Sense that will own it,) we may easily then perceive what Judgment to make of *Anastasius*, as Mr. *Arnaud* handles him.

BUT 'tis certain by what I now said that *Anastasius* believed neither Transubstantiation, nor the real Presence, for had he believed it, he would never have reasoned as he does, nor supposed (as he has done) a Principle altogether inconsistent with the Romane Doctrine.

BUT what is then this Author's Sense? I answer, that when he say's the *Eucharist* is not common Bread, such as is sold in the Market: His meaning is manifest; to wit, that it is consecrated Bread; when he adds, *That it is not a Figure as that of the He-goat, which the Jews offered*: It is clear he does not absolutely reject the Figure, but in the Sense of a legal Figure, which represented Christ only obscurely and imperfectly, whereas the *Eucharist* is a Mystery, which clearly and perfectly represents the whole Oeconomy of Christ's Incarnation, and Mr. *Arnaud* himself acknowledges, *That altho the Greeks deny the Eucharist to be the Figure of Christ's Body, yet do they affirm it is a Representation of the Mysteries of his Life, and that the same Authors which teach the one, teach the other.* So that so far, there is nothing in *Anastasius*'s Discourse but what is easy. When he adds, *That it is the real Body of Jesus Christ*: He means that it is the Mystery of his Natural Body, which not only

*Ibid.* p. 630:

ly is so perfect a Representation of it, that one may say it is the true Body, and not a Figure; but which even has received the supernatural Form thereof, or if you will, the Character of it, which is its Virtue, in the same Sense that we say of Wax, which has received the Impression of the King's Seal, that it is his real Seal. If we find any roughness in this Expression, we must remember Mr. *Arnaud* finds the same in the Sequel of his Discourse, and that we have shewed that what he calls Roughness is meer Absurdity. Whence it follows that it is more reasonable to suffer that which is only a bare Roughness and Offensiveness in the Terms, and which moreover does well agree with *Anastasius* his Reasoning, than that wherein common Sense is not to be found. We must likewise remember the Exposition which the *Greeks* themselves do give to these kind of Expressions, that the *Eucharist* is the true Body, the Body it self, the proper Body of Christ; to wit, inasmuch as it is an Augmentation thereof which makes not another Body, but is the same, as we have already shewed in the foregoing Book. We must know, in fine, that the *Eutychiens* against whom *Anastasius* Disputes were wont to attribute to Christ in their Discourses when urged, no other than a phantastical and imaginary Body, and not a real humane Body, which obliged *Anastasius* to say that the *Eucharist* is the real Body of Christ, that is to say, the Mystery, not of a chimerical, but real Body.

THIS being thus cleared up, the Sense of *Anastasius* his Argument lyes open before us. He means, that seeing the Bread is a Mystery in which is expressed the whole *Oeconomy* of Christ's Incarnation, being as it is corruptible, it must necessarily be concluded, that the Body of Christ was in like manner corruptible before his Resurrection, because the Bread was the Mystery of the Body before its Resurrection, and that the same *Oeconomy* which was observed touching the natural Body, whilst it was in the World, is observed in the Bread. Let but *Anastasius* his Discourse be compared with that of *Zonaras*, which I related in the ninth Chapter of the foregoing Book, and *Damasceus*'s in the short Homily which I likewise mentioned in the Chapter touching the Belief of the *Greeks*, and with what I said in the eighth Chapter of this Book, for the explaining *Cabasilas* his Sense, and there will appear no difficulty in it.

*Ibid.* p. 634. AS to that other Passage of *Anastasius* which Mr. *Arnaud* proposed, where in this Author disputes against an Heretick called *Timotheus*, who affirmed the Nature of Christ after the Incarnation, to be the only Divinity. We must make the same Judgment of it as the former. For as to what he say's, *That the Divinity cannot be Detained, Chewed, Divided, Changed, Cut, &c. as is the Eucharist, and that we must according to this Hereticks Doctrine deny the Eucharist to be in truth Christ's visible, terrestrial, and created Body and Blood;* He means that the Accidents which happen to the *Eucharist*, being in no wise agreeable to the Divinity of Christ who is not subject to Change and Alteration; but only to his Body, we must therefore say the Bread does not pass through the same *Oeconomy* under which our Saviour passed; whence it follows that it could not be said as it is, that the Bread was in truth the Body and Blood of Christ, being said to be so only upon the account of the Unity and Identity of this *Oeconomy*. Had he believed Transubstantiation, how could he mis telling his Adversary, 'tis not to be imagined the Substance of Bread is really changed into the very Substance of the Divinity, and that he must of necessity either deny what the whole Church believes; to wit, the Conversion of the Substance of Bread, or fall into this other Absurdity of maintain-  
ing



ing that this Conversion is made in the Divine Nature? Common Sense leads him to this, and yet we find no such thing in all his Discourse.

AFTER *Anastasius* comes *Germain* the Patriarch of *Constantinople*. Mr. *Aubertin* has placed him according to the common Opinion in the eighth Century; but in effect, there is more likelihood, according to *Allatius* his Conjecture that he lived in the twelfth, and the Reflections Mr. *Arnaud* makes on this Subject, seem to me just enough to be followed till we have greater Certainty. But howsoever this Author say's no more than, *That the Bread is changed into the Body of Christ, and that it is his Body.* To which we have so often already answered that it will be needless to say any more. Mr. *Arnaud* sets to Phylosophising on some Passages which Mr. *Aubertin* alledged in his Favour, but this is an Illusion; for when what Mr. *Aubertin* alledges concerning *Germane* to show that 'tis contrary to Transubstantiation, should not be Conclusive, 'twould not thence follow he believed it, nor Taught it, if this does not appear elsewhere from good Proofs; and Mr. *Arnaud* is obliged to produce such, without supposing it is sufficient he Refutes Mr. *Aubertin's* Consequences: For Refuting is not Proving.

Lib. 7. c. 3.

*GERMAIN* sufficiently shews us towards the end of his Treatise, in what Sense he understood the Bread to be the Body of Christ. *Moses*, say's he, *sprinkling the People with the Blood of Goats and Heifers*, said, *This is the Blood of the Covenant.* But our Saviour Christ has given his own proper Body, and shed his own Blood, and given us the Cup of the new Testament; saying, *This is my Body which was broken for you, this is my Blood shed for the Remission of your Sins.* As often then as ye eat this Bread and drink of this Cup, ye declare my Death and Resurrection. Thus believing then we eat the Bread and drink of the Cup, as of the Flesh of God, declaring thereby the Death and Resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ. We have already observed in the foregoing Book, that the Greeks do often use this Expression, *As the Flesh, As the Body*, to mollify and abate in some sort their usual way of speaking, which is, that the Bread is the Body of Christ, and to signify that the Bread is to us instead of this Body. It appears from the sequel of *Germain's* Discourse, his Sense is, that for the better applying our Minds to the Death and Resurrection of our Lord, we eat the Bread and drink of the Cup, in the stead of his Body and Blood.

Geru. Theor.  
ver. Eccles sub  
finem.

AS to *John Damascen*, the Author of the *Perpetuity* having alledged him as a Witness of the Doctrine of the ancient Church. I said, *He ought not to produce the Testimony of a Person whom we except against, and that with good Cause, seeing he was one of the first that left the common Road of the Churches Expressions, and betook himself to affected and singular ones, which are at as great distance from the Roman Church as the reformed one.* Now this Exception is so just in respect of the Question concerning the Sentiment of the ancient Church, that excepting Mr. *Arnaud*, I do not believe there is any Man, how little Conversant soever in the Writings of the Fathers, but grants it. For all the Ancient Fathers term the *Eucharist* a Figure or Representation of our Lord's Body, and *Damascen* not only deny's that it is one, but also that the Fathers thus termed it after Consecration. He is one of the first that brought into Credit the Comparison of Food which changes it self into our Bodies, whereby to explain the Change which happens to the Bread, in as much as it is made an Augmentation of the Body of Christ, that of the Blessed Virgin which the Holy Spirit overshadowed, and that of Wood united to the Fire. His Expressions being compared with those of the Ancients, are wholly extra-

Answer to the  
2d. Treatise of  
the Perpet. c. 2.

ordinary. He tells us that the Sacramental Bread, and the Body born of the Virgin, are but one and the same Body, because the Bread is an Augmentation of the Body, and that the same *Oeconomy* has been observed in both. I suppose *Damascen* was not the first that had these kind of Conceptions, seeing we have met with something like this in *Anastafius* his Discourse, and if I mistake not, some Trace of this in *Gregory de Nysses* his Catechism; but howsoever it must be acknowledged I had reason to call these Conceptions *Affected* and *Singular* in respect of the usual Expressions of the Fathers, and to say, they vary as much from the Doctrine of the Romane Church as ours.

YET to hear only Mr. *Arnaud*, a Man would imagine that *Damascen* clearly taught Transubstantiation. To prove it he alleges these same Passages of his fourth Book touching the true Orthodox Faith which has been a thousand times canvass'd by Controvertists, and which conclude nothing. *Damascen* say's, That God makes the Bread the Body of Christ, and the Wine his Blood, that it is an effect of his Almighty Power, which has created all things; that seeing the Lord took his Body from the pure and immaculate Blood of the Virgin, we must not doubt but he can change the Bread into his Body, and the Wine into his Blood; that if we demand how this Change happens, he answers, that this is wrought by the Holy Spirit, that the Word of God is True and Almighty; but that the manner is Incomprehensible. But yet it may be rationally say'd, that as the Bread and Wine (wherewith a Man is nourished) are changed into his Body, so that they become another Body than that which they were before; so the Bread and Wine mixt with Water, are changed into the Body and Blood of Christ in a wonderful manner, by Prayer and Descent of the Holy Spirit, and that they are not two different Bodies, but one and the same Body.

HAD not *Damascen* expressed himself as he has done, it would be to no purpose for us to tell Mr. *Arnaud* the Change he speaks of is not Transubstantiation, seeing his Sence is that the Bread becomes a growth of our Lord's Body, and is made by this means one with this Body, that this is the effect he attributes to the Holy Spirit, and Almighty Power of God, acting above Nature, and not that of a real Conversion of the Substance of Bread into the same Substance which the Body had before: Mr. *Arnaud* would not fail to term this Extravagancy and Dorage. But seeing we say no more in this matter than what is grounded on *Damascen's* own Words, as it appears by what we related when we treated on the real Belief of the Greeks; This Illustration will be sufficient, without proceeding any farther, to make Insignificant this long Chapter which Mr. *Arnaud* has written touching the Equivocal Expressions of this Author. In effect, let him say as long as he pleases, That the Point here concerns neither Figure nor Virtue, that this effect which surpasses humane Conception is in *Damascen's* Sence this; to wit, That the Bread is made the Body of Jesus Christ, that it is the Body really united to the Divinity, the Body taken from the Virgin, because the Bread and Wine are changed into the Body and Blood of God. That *Damascen* speaks of it as if he designed to refute expressly all the Attempts and Shifts of the Ministers, some of whom turn his Words into a change of Virtue, and others to an Imaginary Union of the Holy Spirit, with the Bread remaining Bread. That the Fathers have expressed themselves after two different manners, that is to say, sometimes as Philosophers, and otherwhiles as Divines. All this signifies nothing, considering the Explication which *Damascen* himself hath given us of his own Sence, in his Letter to *Zacharias* Bishop of *Doarus*, and Homily at the end of it. These two Pieces published by the Abbot *Billins*, and which were acknowledged for Authentick

Authentick by *Labbus* the Jesuit, the learned *M. de Marca* Arch-Bishop of *Paris*, and *Leo Allatius* himself, Mr. *Arnaud's* great Author: These two Pieces I say end the Difference, and suffer us not any longer to dispute about *Damascene*. I shall only say that Mr. *Arnaud* has not done fairly in relating the Passages of the fourth Book of the Orthodox Faith, to leave out this Homily and Letter as he has done.

## CHAP. X.

An Examination of the Advantages which Mr. *Arnaud* draws from the two Councils held in Greece in the eighth Century, upon the Subject of Images, the one at Constantinople, and th'other at Nice.

I T cannot without doubt but trouble good People to see how Mr. *Arnaud* suffers his Pen to be guided by his Passion, and fills up his Book with Injuries, so ill becoming a Man of his Age and Profession; making them continually the Subject of his Eloquence: Yet in truth are we obliged to him for this way of proceeding, not only for that thereby he gives us Occasion to exercise our Christian Patience, but does also himself furnish us with an assured means of bringing his Chapters into a lesser Compass. And to this end we shall pass by all his personal Reflections as Matters which concern not our Dispute. Let us then consider those four terrible Chapters wherein he Treats of the two Councils which were held in the eighth Century, the one at Constantinople against Images, and the other at Nice for them.

MR. *Arnaud* begins with the Council of *Nice*, that is to say with a Writing which the Fathers of this Council caused to be read in the sixth Session, from whence he forms these five Propositions. 1<sup>st</sup>. That the Eucharist was not called by the Name of Image or Figure, by the Apostles and Fathers after Consecration. 2<sup>dly</sup>. That they have called it the Body it self, and the Blood it self. 3<sup>dly</sup>. That the Gifts are properly Body and Blood. 4<sup>ly</sup>. That they are not Images, but Body and Blood. 5<sup>ly</sup>. That it is impossible they should be both the Image and Body of Christ, so that being the Body, they are not the Image. He moreover tells us that *Anastasius* made use of the same Reasoning to shew the Eucharist is not an Image. That *John Damascen* likewise used it, and *Nicephorus* the Patriarch of Constantinople concludes after the same manner, that the Eucharist is not the Image of Christ, because it is his Body. Whereupon Mr. *Arnaud* cries out, These are the very things wherein Arguments are useless, and wherein the Impression of Truth appears so plainly, that those that deny it are to be regarded as Persons no longer to be reasoned with. But how clear soever his Motives may be, we can assure him this comes from his Prejudice, and not from the Truth. The Understanding of all these Discourses of the Adversaries of the Iconoclastes, depends only on the knowing in what Sense they meant the Eucharist is properly the Body and Blood of Christ. For this Point being once dispatched, we shall soon perceive why they denyed it was an Image, and wherefore they thus reasoned, that being an Image, it could not be the Body.



We must observe all these *Greeks* have followed the Opinion of *Damasen*, and speak as he does; that they borrow all his Conceptions and Expressions, as appears by the Writing which was read in the second Council of *Nice*, by the Fragment of *Theodorus Graptus*, and Mr. *Arnaud's* own Author *Nicephorus*.

NOW after the Notices *Damasen* has given us, we can no longer doubt but their Sence is, that the Bread and Wine are made the Body and Blood of Christ, inasmuch as that receiving the Supernatural Virtue of this Body and Blood, they are a Growth and Augmentation thereof, and therefore are not two Bodies, but one and the same Body, the proper Body of Christ, as the Food becomes our proper Body.

*Allat. de Ec-  
cles. Occid. &  
Orient. Perp.  
Consens. Lib. 3.  
cap. 15.*

AND this will appear from the bare reading of a Passage in *Nicephorus*, which Mr. *Arnaud* himself has related and taken from *Allatius*: And if it be needful, say's he, to explain these things, by what passes in our selves, as the Bread, Wine, and Water are naturally changed into the Body and Blood of those that eat and drink them, and become not another Body, so these Gifts by the Prayer of him that Officiates, and Descent of the Holy Spirit are changed supernaturally into the Body and Blood of Christ. For this is the Contents of the Priest's Prayer, and we do not understand they are two Bodies; but we believe it be but one and the same Body. And this is the *Greeks Hypothesis*, the Bread is made the proper Body of Christ, as the Meat we eat becomes our Body, to wit, inasmuch as it is united to it, and receives its Form, increases and augments it.

THE same will appear if we compare the Discourses of the Fathers of *Constantinople* with the Censure past on them in the Council of *Nice*. The Fathers of *Constantinople* called the *Eucharist*, a chosen Matter, a Substance of Bread. Those of *Nice* were not offended thereat; Neither at the others calling the *Eucharist*, Bread filled with the Holy Spirit, an Oblation translated from a common State, to a State of Holyness, a Body made Divine by a Sanctification of Grace: So far they agree. But when the Fathers of *Constantinople* call the Bread an Image, those of *Nice* could not suffer it, neither could they bear with them in saying it is the Body by Institution. Why do they make this Difference, but because these first Expressions which are contrary to Transubstantiation and the substantial Presence, yet do not contradict their Hypothesis of Augmentation by an Impression of Virtue, whereas the others oppose it? For they do not say the Food is the Image of our Body, nor our Body by Institution, but that it becomes our Proper Body, not another; but the same we had before.

THIS Point being thus cleared up, it is easy to perceive why these Persons deny'd the *Eucharist* to be an Image. For it was not because they believed the Substance of Bread did not remain, or imagined it 'twas absolutely and by a numerical Identity (as the Church of *Rome* speaks) the same Substance of the Natural Body; but because they believed that the Bread keeping its proper Substance became the proper Body of our Lord by this way of Growth or Augmentation, in receiving the Impression of his Supernatural Virtue, so that in this Respect it was the same thing with them, whether the Bread was Virtually the Body of Christ, or properly. They found then that the simple Notion of Image was inconsistent with that of Propriety, and thereupon denied

denied the *Eucharist* to be an Image or Representation.

THEY Argued from the same Principle, when they said 'tis not possible these Gifts could be both, *The Body, and the Image of the Body, and being the Body, they could not be the Image of them.* For they believed the Term of *Image* excluded this propriety of *Virtue* which they established, and that to call them Image, was to regard them in no other manner than that wherein they were before their Consecration.

IT is easy to perceive that their Arguing on the Discourse of the Fathers of *Constantinople* is but a mere Sophism. For besides that these Fathers, termed not the *Eucharist*, the proper Body of Christ, and consequently could not be charged with Contradiction, nor told, *Si imago est, non potest esse hoc Divinum*: besides this I say, all their Subtilty lyes in a mere Quibble about Words. They will not receive the Term of *Imago*, and yet admit those of *Representation*, a *Remembrance* and *Symbol*, as Mr. Arnaud himself acknowledges. We do not call (say's Theodorus Graptus (an Author of the ninth Century) *the sacred Mysteries of Christ, the Images of his Body, altho they become Symbols thereof*; *ἐἰ καὶ συμβολικῶς ὑπὸτιθέσθαι.* Nicephorus say's the same thing, *We do not call these Gifts, either Images or Figures of this Body, altho they be Representations thereof*: Which shews they regarded more the manner of expressing the Thing, than the Thing it self.

*Origin. verumq;  
Constantinop.  
varius autor.  
manipulus a  
Francis. Com-  
besix. ubi  
Supra.*

BUT let us see what Advantage Mr. Arnaud pretends to draw hence. P. 664. 665. First, he endeavours to prove that these Authors who wrote against the *Iconoclastes* did not believe 'twas contrary to the notion of an Image to contain the Virtue of the Original, nor established this Principle: *The Image is not the thing it represents*, in this Sence here; *The Image is not virtually the thing it represents.* For say's he, *In the same place wherein they establish this Principle, the Image is not the thing it self which it represents, they bring Instances of Images which contain really the Virtue of their Original, and even its Essence.* Nicephorus the Patriarch of Constantinople who Refutes the *Iconoclastes* by the same Argument, by which the second Council of Nice say's, *That that which is the Image of a thing, cannot be its Body, for every Image is another thing than what it represents.* It is True, adds he, *That the Scripture calls the Son the Image of the Father, but he is likewise distinguished from him by an Hypostasis and Person.*

I Answer Nicephorus his Sence is, that to exclude the Notion of Image, we must say it is the thing it self: And on the contrary to establish it, there must be no means left to say, it is the thing it self. Now altho the Son hath the same Nature and Essence as the Father, yet we cannot say he is the Father, for they are different Persons: So the Son may be well called the Image of the Father. But altho the *Eucharist* be not in Substance the Body of Christ, and contains only its Virtue, yet we may very well say, it is this very Body, because an Augmentation does not make another Body than that which was before, but is the same; and thus the *Eucharist* cannot be called an Image.

BUT, say's Mr. Arnaud, *The Son contains the Virtue of the Father, Nicephorus understands not then his own Principle, That the Image is not the thing which it represents; in Mr. Claude's fantastical Sence, that it is not virtually the thing whose Image it is: For it would necessarily follow hence that the Son of* *God*

*ibid.*

*God*

God is not an Image, seeing he contains not only the Virtue, but the very Essence of his Father. This must necessarily follow according to Mr. Arnaud, but not according to right Reason; For it is true the Son contains the Essential Virtue of the Father, as being not the Image of his Essence; but he does not contain the personal Virtue of it, for he has not the Virtue of begetting another Son, nor according to the *Greeks*, that of the Emanation of the Holy Spirit, and consequently he may well be called the Image of the Father's Person. Had *Nicephorus* understood his Principle in this Sense, no Image is in Substance the thing it represents, as Mr. Arnaud supposes he did, and as in Effect he must understand it to add, *But the Eucharist is in Substance the Body of Christ, it is not then the Image of it*, It would sooner and more naturally follow, that the Son of God would be in no wise an Image; for he most really contains the Nature, Essence, and Substance of his Father.

*Ibid.*

*Nicephorus*, adds Mr. Arnaud, *Supposes the Eucharist is not really distinguished from the Body of Christ, and thereby proves that it is not the Figure of it.* Si igitur Sanctum corpus quod in communione sumitur, imago Christi est, aliud dicitur esse præter corpus Christi; *That is to say, if the Eucharist were an Image, it would be really a distinct thing from the Body of Christ: But it is not distinct from it, Therefore it is not an Image.* *Nicephorus* will suppose the Eucharist is not a real distinct thing from the Body of Christ, when we admit Mr. Arnaud's that is to say; but he will not suppose it when we shall consider that the Proposition he rejects is this, *Sanctum corpus in communione quod sumitur est aliud præter corpus Christi.* The Holy Body we receive in the Communion, is something else besides the Body of Christ: and that the contrary Proposition which he establishes is, *Sanctum corpus quod in communione sumitur non est aliud præter corpus Christi:* The Holy Body we receive in the Communion is nothing else but the Body of Christ; That is to say in a Word, that they are not two Bodies, but one, because the Growth of a Body does not make another Body. But this is not to say but that there is a true and real Difference between the Substance which encreases a thing, and the thing it self which is encreased.

The Bishops of Nice and *Nicephorus*, (say's moreover Mr. Arnaud) did they not know that the Water of Baptism and Oyl, are the Figure of the Holy Spirit according to the Fathers; which made *Aubertin* himself say: *Docent veteres aquam & oleum post consecrationem representare spiritum sanctum.* And were they ignorant that they contained and communicated the Virtue of it? It is strange a Person so confident of his own Abilities, should be so grossly mistaken in what he alleges concerning Mr. *Aubertin*, and not observed that in this place Mr. *Aubertin* takes the Term of Representare in the Sense which Cardinal *Perron* gives it, for *Præsens reddere, exhibere*; that is to say for, to make present, give, communicate, and not for to figure, as appears thro the whole Sequel of his Discourse. The Question concerned a Passage of *Tertullian*, which bears *That Christ represents his Body by the Bread*: Cardinal *Perron* alleged that by Represent, we must understand, make Present, Communicate, Exhibit. Mr. *Aubertin* having shewed that this Expression was used by the Fathers to signify to Figure, supposes *Perron's* Sense to be good, and shews thereupon that the Passage out of *Tertullian* does notwithstanding overthrow Transubstantiation; for it must still be said that the Bread remains Bread. And because it might be answered that by the Bread we may understand the Accidents of Bread: He Refutes this Evasion and say's, *Docent veteres aquam & oleum post consecrationem representare spiritum sanctum sicut ait Tertullianus*



*Tertullianus pane representari corpus Christi, sic enim Cyrillus, sive Author Catecheseon illi tributatum, oleum post invocationem, &c. Christi & Spiritus sancti charisma est & divinitatis ipsius presentia operativum, Sic Basilius & Ambrosius in aqua Baptismi presentiam spiritus esse asserunt, Nec tamen quis dixerit per oleum & aquam intelligenda esse accidentia olei & aqua, Whence it appears that Mr. Arnaud can be mistaken as well as other People, for this Passage of Mr. Aubertin cannot be alledged to prove the Fathers taught that Baptism and Oyl are the Figures of the Holy Spirit, but by a very great Mistake.*

BUT to proceed, I say it is not sufficient to shew what the Fathers taught concerning Baptism and Oyl; it must be shewed that *Nicephorus* and the Council of *Nice* have expressly called them *Images of the Holy Spirit*, for otherwise there can be nothing concluded in respect of them. *They knew*, say's he, *that they are the Figure of the Holy Spirit according to the Fathers.* But they might likewise as well know that the *Eucharist* is the Figure, and Image of the Body of Christ according to the Fathers, and yet they for all that deny it, and affirm none of the Fathers so term it after Consecration. Moreover *Nicephorus* and the Fathers of *Nice* may tell him, that whatsoever Virtue accompanies Baptism and Oyl, yet they are not made the Growth of the Holy Spirit, as the Bread and Wine of the *Eucharist* are made the Growth of the Body and Blood of Christ, and consequently they are not Virtually the same thing.

WHAT Mr. *Arnaud* adds, *That they themselves made use of the Miracles wrought by Images, to establish the Worship of them, and that the Author of the Theory of Ecclesiastical Matters, say's, That the unconsecrated Bread, which is the Type of the Virgin Mary's Body, communicated to those that participated of it an ineffable Benediction.* This I say, does not deserve an Answer, for it does not appear these People ever attributed to Images a supernatural Virtue, ordinarily residing in them, which might make them say that the Images are changed into the Virtue of Christ, or his Saints; much less that the Image is a Growth of Christ or his Saints. And as to the Bread which according to *Germain* is the Type of the Virgin *Mary's* Body, the ineffable Benediction which he say's it communicates, is not the Virtue of the Virgin's Body, of which it is the Type.

NEITHER does it in fine, signify any thing to say, *That the Figure represents it self to the Original, and not to the Virtue; that it is opposite to the Original, that 'tis from the Original from which 'tis distinguished, that when it is deprived of Virtue, it is by Accident, and that 'tis every whit as ridiculous to say a Figure ceases to be a Figure, because it becomes Efficacious, as to say a Statue ceases to be a Statue when it is gilt.* For it is true that the first and most natural Opposition is between the Figure and the Original, and that the Figure is only opposed to the Virtue, inasmuch as that by the Impression of Virtue, a thing becomes in some sort the Original in a proper Sence. Thus the Food we eat becomes in some sort in a proper Sence the Body we had before, altho it be in effect of a distinct Substance, or Matter, seeing it is not the same Substance, or the same Matter in number, but an addition to our former Substance, yet do we oppose it to the Figure, and say 'tis not the Image of our Body, but our Body, our proper Body, the very Body which we had before and not another. Now it is thus the Fathers of *Nice* oppose the Figure to the Eucharistical Bread, and say it ceases to be a Figure; to wit, then when by the Impression of the supernatural Virtue of our Lord's Body it becomes this

this proper Body, not another, as we have already a thousand times explained.

Lib. 7. c. 6.  
p. 678.

C. 6. p. 674.

Lib. 7. c. 2.  
p. 630.

Bessarion de  
de Sacram.  
Eucharist.

AND this is what Mr. *Arnaud* has said of most Moment touching the second Council of *Nice*, and other Adversaries of the *Iconoclastes*. What he after adds consists only in Repetitions, or Matters of small Importance, and which may be easily Refuted by his own Words. For Example, what he say's touching the Water of Baptism, and Oyl, that they are Figures which contain Virtue, is an Objection he has several times made, and which we have already answered. What he say's touching the State of an Image, that it has not any Inconsistency in it self, neither Real nor Apparent, with a Consecration which would fill the Bread and Wine with the Virtue of Christ's Body, has been already refuted; For in the Sence of the *Greeks* the State of Image is Inconsistent, with what the Bread and Wine become by the Impression they receive from the Virtue of Christ's Body, because they become in a certain Sence, the proper Body and Blood of Christ. So that whatsoever Mr. *Arnaud* say's in general touching the two States, the one Consistent, and the other Inconsistent, has no Foundation. We know there are Consistent and Inconsistent States; but the Question is whether the *Greeks* might not believe without being Extravagant and Senceless, that there was an Inconsistency between these two Expressions, *The Eucharist is the Image of the Body of Christ, and the Eucharist is the proper Body of Christ*, altho they understood a Propriety by an Impression of Virtue. I confess there is not between these two States of Image, and proper Body in the Sence wherein those of *Nice* understood them, a real Inconsistency; But we must likewise acknowledg that there is an apparent one, especially when 'tis made to consist only in the Terms, as I believe these *Greeks* have made it. If Mr. *Arnaud* will have them make it to consist in the same thing, besides that this Difference will be of small Importance as to the Main, I need only offer him what himself has told us concerning *Anastasius* and others, who denyed the *Eucharist* was a Figure. That these were not two inconsistent Principles, nor two contrary Expressions in the Language of those Times, to say that the *Eucharist* is not the Figure of Christ's Body, and yet a Representation of the Mysteries of his Life, and that the same Authors that teach the one, teach us likewise the other. I need only tell him that in the same Place wherein they earnestly deny the *Eucharist* to be an Image, they acknowledg it is a Symbol, and that *Damascen* himself who will not suffer it to be called an Image or Type, yet assures us that the same *Oeconomy* which was observed in Christ's natural Body, is observed in the Bread; which establisheth a true Resemblance at bottom. I need only offer him the Exposition *Bessarion* makes of *Damascen's* Words. By the Figure, say's he, he means a Shadow which is no more than a Figure barely signifying another Subject, yet without having any Substance for acting.

C. 6. p. 680.

MR. *Arnaud* answering this Passage of *Bessarion*, which I offered against the Author of the *Perpetuity*, say's, That *Bessarion* had reason to say *St. John Damascen*, in denying the *Eucharist* to be a Figure, means a bare Figure without Efficacy. Not that he pretends an efficacious Figure is not a Figure; but he supposes to say the *Eucharist* is the Sign of *Iesus Christ*, and not his Body, is as much as to say it is a bare Figure without Virtue and Efficacy, because the Quality of a Figure does not include any Virtue, and that it would have no other which could give it this Virtue. So that according to *Bessarion* 'tis certain that *Damascen* in denying the *Eucharist* to be a Figure of *Iesus Christ*, means by the Word Figure a Shadow, and a Figure without Efficacy, because that in effect

fect if the Eucharist be a bare Figure, it would be a Figure without Efficacy, and there would be no place of Scripture which could prove this Efficacy, as we will shew elsewhere. This Proposition then is true in one Sence, if the Eucharist were but a Figure, it would be but an empty Figure. But this is not true in any Sence, seeing if the Figure were an Efficacious Figure, it would not be a Figure.

HE means it is impossible to attribute any Virtue to the Eucharist, if it be not acknowledged the Body of Christ in Substance. But 1<sup>st</sup>. This Principle is false in it self, and the contrary may be proved by an Instance from Scripture, which St. Paul calls *The Power of God to Salvation, Rom. 1.* And by the Example of Baptism, which is accompanied with the Virtue of Christ's Blood, and which according to the Scripture is the Laver of our Regeneration. In effect, to apply to us the supernatural Virtue of the Body of Christ, it is not necessary that the Substance of this Body be locally in the Eucharist, it is sufficient that his Spirit be in it, and operates therein. 2<sup>ly</sup>. It is false, there is no Passage of Scripture whereby to prove this Efficacy. That which our Saviour himself say's, *Do this in Remembrance of me*; and what St. Paul adds, *That as often as we eat of this Bread, and drink of this Cup, we shew forth the Lord's Death till he comes*; this I say includes the Communication of his Virtue. For Christ and his Death, are not Objects of a mere historical Consideration. It is the same with this Divine Saviour as with the Sun; which it is impossible to behold without being inlightned by it, and cheared with its Rays. If we behold him, say's one of the Prophets, *we are inlightned by him*. To declare his Death as we ought, is without doubt an Action inseparable from the feeling of his Efficacy; and that Man who deny's this Truth, knows little of Christ. 3<sup>ly</sup>. Neither is it true that Damascen opposes those that deny the Eucharist to be the Body of Christ in Substance, and say it is only so in Virtue, neither is it true Bessarion imputes to him this Reasoning, *Were not the Eucharist the proper Substance of Christ's Body, it would be no more than a mere Figure without Virtue and Efficacy*. This is one of Mr. Arnaud's Circuits which has no Grounds either in the Passage of Damascen, nor in that of Bessarion. Bessarion indeed would have Damascen to believe Transubstantiation and the substantial Presence; for being a Cardinal in the Roman Church, 'tis no marvel he maintained not the contrary; but he does not say Damascen argued as Mr. Arnaud supposes. 4<sup>ly</sup>. Mr. Arnaud does himself furnish us wherewithal to dissipate all his Subtilties touching the Council of Nice; for we need only apply to the Council of Nice what he say's concerning Damascen, in making these Fathers argue after this manner; *To say the Eucharist is an Image of Christ, is the same as to say 'tis no more than a bare Image without any Efficacy, because the Quality of an Image includes not any Virtue, and the Eucharist cannot have elsewhere this Virtue, there being no place of Scripture which attributes it to it, nor from whence it can be concluded*. Now the Iconoclastes affirm the Eucharist to be an Image. They say then that 'tis a bare Image without Virtue and Efficacy, and consequently they contradict themselves, when they afterwards call it the Body of Jesus Christ; for if it be a mere Image, it cannot be Virtually this Body. This Reasoning attributed to the Fathers of Nice, would be better grounded than that which he Imputes to Damascen, because it does not appear Damascen Disputes against Persons that Expounded the Words of Christ, *This is my Body* in this Sence, *This is the Figure of my Body*; whereas it appears that the Iconoclastes had Expounded them in this Sence, *This is the Image of my Body*; whence it follows they might been told better than they have been by Damascen, that having no other Passage of Scripture whereby to prove it was the Body of Christ in Vir-



tue, it was no more according to them, than a mere Image without any Efficacy.

- C. 6. p. 683. AS to what Mr. Arnaud say's, *That altho Paschasius his Adversaries Expounded these Words, The Body of Fesus Christ, the Virtue of Fesus Christ, yet did they not say it was the Body it self, that they made not use of this Principle, the Figure is not the Original, to shew the Eucharist was the Original and not the Figure; That they did not make this ridiculous Argument, The Eucharist contains the Virtue of Christ's Body; It is not then the Figure of it.* I answer, we Cited not Paschasius his Adversaries for that purpose. We instanced them to shew, that it is no new or extraordinary Matter, to understand by the Body of Christ, his Body in Virtue, seeing several in the ninth Century understood it in this manner. *But,* say's he, *they said not the Eucharist was properly and truly the Body of Christ.* It does not in effect appear to us they did say it, nor denied it was a Figure, nor reasoned like the Adversaries of the Iconoclastes, and from thence we may well conclude they admitted not the intire Hypothesis of the Greeks, which is, that this Body of Christ in Virtue, is an Augmentation of the natural Body, to infer from thence that it is properly his Body, and not the Figure of it. But this does not hinder but that by the Term of Body, they understood the Virtue of the Body. *Had their Error,* say's Mr. Arnaud, *led them to understand by the Word Body, the Figure and Virtue, common Sence would have forced 'em to explain themselves in proper Terms, to make themselves understood.* But I say the Greeks do explain themselves in proper Terms. *Ely de Crete* who assisted at the Council of Nice, does not he plainly say, *That the Bread is changed into the Efficacy of Christ's Body?* Did not *Cyrillus of Alexandria*, and *Eutychius*, say the same thing? Did not *Theophylact* Express himself in the same manner? Has not *Damascen* said *That it is Bread united to the Divinity, a Growth of the Body of Christ?* Does not *Nicolaus Methonienis* tell us, *That Christ Joyns his Divinity to these Things which are familiar to our Natures?* And how many more such like Expositions are to be met with in the Passages I already produced? Let Mr. Arnaud say as long as he pleases, *This Language is so Unnatural and Strange, that to make this pretended Sence of it Intelligible, it ought to be proclaimed with sound of Trumpet throughout all the East, and Notice given to all People that these Words were to be understood in this unheard of Sence: Otherwise all these Authors ought to be esteemed as Cheats and Impostors.* The Greeks will answer him that all his Rhetorick is void of Reason, in whatsoever Humour it comes from him: They have sufficiently Explained themselves to those that have Ears: They are not Deceivers; for they never so much as once said the *Eucharist* was the natural Body of Christ in Propriety of Substance, but often the contrary, namely his Body in Virtue.
- Ibid.
- Ibid.
- Com. in Greg. Naz.
- C. 5. p. 669.

IT were better in my Mind to reserve these Proclamations he speaks of, to publish to the World there ought no more of those Passages of the Fathers to be alledged, seeing they are so troublefom to Mr. Arnaud. For seeing I have incurred his Indignation, for quoting a Passage out of *Facundus*, it is fitting the World should henceforward know how to avoid offending him. *This Passage,* say's he, *of Facundus must be brought in every where right or wrong.* — The Question is whether the Term of the Body of Fesus Christ may be taken for the Virtue and Efficacy of this Body, in which Point *Facundus* is silent. The Question is whether the Term of the Body of Christ can be taken in another Sence, than for the Substance of Christ's natural Body, and of this *Facundus* speaks. To contain the Mystery of Christ's Body, and to contain

tain the Virtue of it, are two Expressions which signify at bottom the same thing in *Facundus* his Sence, and it is upon good Grounds we have alledged him. But when a Passage perplexes Mr. *Arnaud*, it must be laid aside, because it disturbs his Brain. Omitting then *Facundus* for this time, in compliance to Mr. *Arnaud*; pass we on to the Council of *Constantinople*, termed *Iconoclastes*.

THIS Council say's first, *That our Saviour has commanded us to offer an Image, a chosen Matter, that is to say the Substance of Bread.* It is clear their Sence is, that that which is offered in the *Eucharist*, and which is an Image, is the Substance of Bread. To say thereupon their Sence is, not that it is in Effect a Substance of Bread, but only a Matter which keeps the Figure and Resemblance of it, is in my Mind as frivolous a Shift and Evasion as ever was used; for what may not a Man elude if he may expound these Terms, *The Substance of Bread*, by these, *Not the Substance of Bread, but the Figure and Resemblance*? Besides this Mr. *Arnaud* tells me, *That I may not so much as humbly propose my Doubts, and must be known to be a Person extream modest, otherwise all People will wonder so easy a matter should startle me, that I consult not common Sence, touching what I ought to say, and that my Head is so full of Calvinistical Subtilities, that I cannot speak after the rate of other Men.* He afterwards falls upon a Discourse which takes up six great Pages, which amount to this; *That when the Judgment of Reason or Faith, is contrary to the Ideas of Sence and Concupiscence, there is form'd two sorts of Languages which subsist together, the one Conformable to the Ideas of Sence and Concupiscence, and the other to Faith and Reason.* To establish this Principle he say's, *That Faith changes the Judgment of Sence and Concupiscence, and shews us that what we call Good is areal Evil, that our Evils are reall Goods, that those who are called Happy, are really Miserable; the Rich, Poor; the Poor, Rich; the Wise, Fools; the Prudent, Imprudent; and the Knowing, Ignorant.* He adds, *That Philosophy oft overthrows the common Notions of things: That the Thomists affirm Matter has no Existence, that a dead Body has nothing in common with a living one, that some Philosophers of this Age teach that Animals are only Machins, and Automates, and sensible Qualities are not in the things themselves, but are the Impressions of our Sences. That several of the most profound Astrologers believe with Copernicus, that the Sun and Stars are unmovable, and that 'tis the Earth which by its various Motions makes Day and Night, and Variety of Seasons.* He tells us afterwards, *That there is in all these things a two-fold Language, the one according to Appearance, and the other according to Truth. That 'tis the same in respect of the Eucharist, Faith correcting in it the Ideas of Sence, and from thence comes this twofold Language, the one by which we call the Eucharist Bread, Substance of Bread, Matter of Bread, and the other by which we call it the Body of Christ.*

*Apud. Concil.  
Nicen. art. 6.*

*C. 7. p. 689.*

*Ibid. c. 7.*

NOT to proceed without profiting by Mr. *Arnaud*'s Advertisement, lest he should accuse me of Dulness: I shall venture again humbly to offer the Doubts wherewith common Sence furnishes me after Consultation with it, against his pretended Solution. 1<sup>st</sup>. It seems to me to contain all the Characters of a Mind perplext and tormented with Study, how to extricate it self out of a Difficulty, through which it can find no natural Passage. What relation has the Ideas of Concupiscence, the Philosophy of the Thomists, Cartesians, Coperniciens, with the Discourse of these good Greek Bishops who lived in the eighth Century, and who without doubt had none of this Philosophy in their Heads? Who can Imagine that their Expressions which are plain and

simple, should be grounded on the Model of these twofold Languages, that is to say, on an Observation which scarcely ever any Person before thought of, so remote are these twofold Languages from the Sight and common Use of the World? In truth, I could never imagine the Ideas of Concupiscence, the dead Bodies of the Thomists, nor the Impressions, or Automates of the Carthesians, and *Copernicus* his Systems, should ever be brought into our Dispute, to decide the Question, whether the *Greeks* believe Transubstantiation or not.

II. WHAT likelihood is there that Bishops assembled in Council, whose Words were to regulate the Peoples Faith, and whom it behooved moreover to speak discreetly, having Adversaries at their Backs, should lay aside the Style of Religion, if we believe *Mr. Arnaud*, to take up that of Sence, which Religion condemns? That they should call the *Eucharist* without any Necessity, a *Matter*, and *Substance of Bread*, considering it even after Consecration, without adding to it either any Exposition or Mollification, and expose themselves so imprudently to the Reproaches of their Enemies, from whom they could expect no Favour nor Support, and who waited for an Occasion to render them Odious to the People.

III. BUT how came it to pass their Adversaries, (who, that they might censure them touching the Term of Image, dared assert contrary to the Truth, that none of the Fathers gave the Term of Image to the *Eucharist* after Consecration,) were so mild and favourable as to pardon them of *Substance of Bread*, were their Faith in effect that of the Church of *Rome*, that it is no longer the Substance of Bread? Did they do this upon the account of the Thomists dead Bodies, the Cartesians Automates, or *Copernicus* his System?

IV. IF we examine these Instances of a twofold Language which *Mr. Arnaud* proposes, we shall find they are all Defective, either in respect of themselves, or in the Application he makes of them: It is not true Religion absolutely teaches that what we call Goods, are real Evils; and that our Evils are real Goods; nor that it turns Felicity into Misery, Riches into Poverty, Poverty into Riches, Wisdom into Folly, Prudence into Imprudence, and Knowledge into Ignorance. Religion teaches that these things are, in Effect and in themselves, what we term them, because they are either Blessings and God's temporal Favours, or Chastisements and Afflictions which come from his Hand; and so far its Language agrees very well with the usual Speech of Men. But it also shews us that these things change their Name and Nature by the good, or bad Use which is made of them; that Riches become real Poverty; Happiness, Misery; Wisdom, Folly; Prudence, Imprudence; and Science, Ignorance; to the Vicious who corrupt these Gifts of God, and change their natural Destination, that Afflictions likewise become Benefits; Poverty, Riches; Misery, Felicity, to a Virtuous Person, and one that fears God. If Concupiscence would oppose it self against this Language, and speak otherwise, Religion will not let her: So that the double Language that there is in respect of these things, is grounded not on the Ideas of Concupiscence, but on Truth it self. When we call Riches, Goods; and Afflictions, Evils; we consider what they are in their own Nature, and when we call them otherwise, we consider 'em in relation to what they are by Accident. These two Languages agree very well, and they are both proper and true, the Ideas of Concupiscence having no part therein. Besides Religion moreover considers temporal



temporal Goods and Evils, either absolutely in themselves, or by Comparison with Spiritual Goods and Evils. In the first respect it tells us that these are Goods and Evils, as they are in effect. In the second she can hardly give them that Name, because they are not considerable in comparison of eternal Goods or Evils. If Concupiscence opposes it self against this Language, and speaks otherwise, Religion restrains Her. It is then certain that the double Language is grounded on various Respects, and is ever true: But it is not the same with the Point in hand. For supposing Transubstantiation we cannot in any respect call the consecrated *Eucharist* a *Substance of Bread*, nor say that we *Offer the Substance of Bread*, and that the *Substance of Bread is the Image of the Body of Jesus Christ*. But Religion will Condemn these Expressions as False in every Sence, and contrary to that Faith which enjoyns us to believe the Substance of Bread does no longer remain. To say that by the Substance of Bread is meant, the bare Figure and Resemblance thereof, as the Author of the *Perpetuity* does: This cannot be, for the Substance, and the simple Appearance are two Terms directly opposite in the Language of Men; and to say the *Substance of Bread*, is as much as to say Real, and not barely Bread in Appearance. Moreover the Fathers of *Constantinople* compare this Substance of Bread, with the Humane Substance which Christ assumed. *As our Lord*, say they, *took on him the Matter only, or Humane Substance, without the Personal Subsistence, so he commanded us to Offer an Image, a chosen Matter, that is to say the Substance of Bread*; which shews they took the Term of Substance in a proper Sence, and not for a simple Appearance. In fine, they say that *as the Humane Substance which Christ assumed has not the Personal Subsistence, so this Substance has not the Form or Humane Figure*, which clearly shews that as by the Humane Substance they meant a Subject capable of having personal Subsistence, so they likewise understood by the Substance used in the *Eucharist*, a real Subject which may have a Form or humane Figure, and consequently a real Substance, capable of Representing an external Form and Figure.

TO say likewise as Mr. *Arnaud* does, that this is the Language of Sence, which is contrary to the Judgment of Faith, is as much as if he had said nothing. For if Faith rectified the Language of Sence, it would not suffer its Expressions to be Regulated by the Falsity of their Testimony, and much less in a Decree of Council, whose Expressions according to Mr. *Arnaud's* Maxims, or the Church he is of, must serve for a Law to Posterity not only for well Speaking, but likewise for well Believing. We ought then keep to the Language of Faith, not that of Sence, against which we must on the contrary Precaution our selves to prevent being surpriz'd by it. When the Christian Religion came into the World, and reform'd the Abuses of Men, who believed their Idols were Gods; She at the same time Corrected their Expressions. She no longer suffered Men to speak of *Gods* in the Plural, nor of *Jupiter*, and *Mercury*, and these other false Divinities as formerly; especially in the Pulpit, and Sermons, or in the Decrees of Councils.

AS to the Example of Philosophers, we must not wonder if they accommodate their Expressions to the Language of other Men, altho it be contrary to their Hypotheses. For they are not the Masters of it, the necessity of making themselves understood, and the fear of passing for Extravagants should they affect a new Style, obliges them to express themselves as the World does, seeing they cannot make it unlearn their Language, and accustom it self to speak according to their Opinions. This shews their  
Opinions

Opinions did not reign when humane Language established it self, and that moreover at this Day they are not Popular; but this does not shew 'twas the same in the Christian Religion, in respect of the *Eucharist*. The Language of the Church touching this Mystery was not found ready made, it was formed on the Sentiments Men began to have of it, as soon as ever 'twas Mention'd. Supposing then that from the first rise of Christianity it were believed the Testimony of our Senses was False and Deceitful, and that the Substance of Bread was really changed into that of the Body of Christ; Men would have avoided speaking according to Sense, and Religion which was the Master of it, would never have suffer'd it. And so much the rather, (if the Supposition be made which I mentioned,) it must be necessarily acknowledged that this Mystery is popular, there being none of the People but ought to know that the Substance which he receives, is not that of Bread, but of the Body of Christ. Besides this, there is a great deal of Difference betwixt Religion and Philosophy; Philosophical Opinions do not so greatly concern the World in general, nor in particular those that hold them, that Men ought to be so much troubled about common Expressions; how contrary soever they may be to these Opinions, and lyable to Error. No Man will be damned for believing a dead Body is the material Part of Man which remains, that Animals are not Automates, but real living Bodies, nor that Colours really in the Objects, nor for believing the Sun and Firmament move, and not the Earth. These Carthelians and Coperniciens have not yet asserted their Sentiments to be necessary to Salvation, nor obligatory on the Conscience. So that if the contrary Sentiments be erroneous, they are not believed to be so dangerous as that humane Speech must be therefore altered. But if Christian Religion has proposed Transubstantiation, or the Substantial Presence, it is to be supposed she has offered it as an Article of Faith necessary to be Believed in order to Salvation, as an Article which obliges the Conscience, and rejected the contrary Opinion as a damnable Error, inconsistent with Salvation, and consequently she ought to warn Men touching the Expressions, and not leave to our Sences; that is to say, to Cheats and Impostors, the Power of making a Council say in a Determination of Faith, that we offer in the *Eucharist* a Substance of Bread.

P. 693.

TO say in fine, this Council only denoted the Matter of the *Eucharist*, as Mr. Arnaud does, is an Unjustifiable Evasion. For when we denoted the Matter of it, by the Term of *Substance of Bread*, we consider it before its Consecration, supposing 'tis believed that by the Consecration 'tis no more the Substance of Bread, but that of the Body of Jesus Christ. Yet these Fathers considered it after the Consecration, as appears by their whole Discourse. Those of *Nice* have thus observed it, for they censure them for calling the *Eucharist* an Image after Consecration. Now in the same place wherein those of *Constantinople* call it Image, they call it likewise a Substance of Bread. If the Censure of those of *Nice* be just, the *Eucharist* must be, according to the Council of *Constantinople*, an Image after Consecration. What likelihood is there Mr. Arnaud should at this time understand better the Sense of this Council of *Constantinople*, than the Fathers of *Nice* who had amongst them several Bishops that Assisted at that Assembly, and amongst others him who presided over it? But I will grant the Nicene Fathers were mistaken, and that Mr. Arnaud understands the Point better than they; yet it is certain they ought to have Censured the Expression of *Substance of Bread*, seeing they could not take it but as spoken of the *Eucharist* after its Consecration. These of *Constantinople* call the *Eucharist* in the same place

CH

Place  
mage  
then n  
likewi  
the fir  
the on  
Hypoth

TH  
rural  
which  
deem  
Sancti  
that th  
be a F  
Binus  
dam sa  
say W  
fication  
could n  
of Con  
he so f  
Reaso  
which  
rence  
say's i  
means  
why r  
gration  
fication  
has do  
ayus  
It is G  
Expre  
gratia  
Grace.  
imme  
Virtue  
is natu  
true In  
rit, th  
to a St  
aration  
so his  
clear t  
receiv  
his Im  
natura  
the Br  
Sancti  
natura  
with th  
ceived

Place and Period, *Image and Substance of Bread*. They take the Name of Image, as a Quality attributed to the *Eucharist* after Consecration. They must then necessarily have taken the Substance of Bread, as an Attribute applied likewise to the *Eucharist* after the Consecration: Yet those of *Nice* Censure the first, and do not in any manner Censure the other; they are Offended at the one, and not at the other; which concludes as I already said, that their *Hypothesis* was not Transubstantiation.

THE Bishops of *Constantinople* comparing the *Eucharist* with Christ's natural Body, say that *as the natural Body is Holy, being made Divine; so that which is his Body by Institution, to wit, his Image is Holy* ὡς διὰ τοῦ ἁγιασμοῦ ἔχειται θεομεν. I Translated these last Words, *being made Divine by a certain Sanctification of Grace*. Mr. Claude, say's Mr. Arnaud, has falsly Translated that the *Eucharist* is made Divine by a certain Sanctification of Grace. If this be a Fault in me, 'tis the same with the Latin Translator of the Council in *Binius* his Edition; for he has inserted these very Words, *Utpote per quandam sanctificationem gratie sanctificata*, and in the Margin, *deificata*, that is to say Word for Word, *As being Sanctifi'd (or made Divine) by a certain Sanctification of Grace*. Mr. Arnaud who justifi'd heretofore *Forbesius*, saying he could not be justly accused for falsifying the Passage of *Jeremias* the Patriarch of *Constantinople*, seeing he only followed the Translation of *Socolovius*; has he so soon changed his Mind, and forgot his own Maxim, without any other Reason, than that there it concerned *Forbesius*, and here my self? Was that which was then Unjust, become now Just and Reasonable by the only Difference of Persons? But let us see whether it is in effect a Falsification. He say's it should be rendred, *Being made Divine by a Favour intirely Gracious by means of a certain Consecration*, because we must joyn ἔχειται το θεομεν, but why rather to θεομεν, than to ἁγιασμοῦ? Why rather Translate ἔχειται, *gracious Favour*, than *Grace*? Why rather ἁγιασμοῦ *Consecration* than *Sanctification*? It is certain the Latin Interpreter could not better Translate than he has done εἰκὼν αὐτοῦ ἁγία, *his Image is Holy*, why is it Holy? ὡς διὰ τοῦ ἁγιασμοῦ ἔχειται θεομεν, *as being made Divine by a certain Sanctification by Grace*. It is Grace which Sanctifies it in making it Divine, which cannot be better Expressed in Latin than by these Words, *Utpote per quandam sanctificationem gratia deificata*; And in English, *As being made Divine by a Sanctification of Grace*. It appears that this is the Sence of this Council by the Words which immediately follow after, *For this is what our Lord design'd to do, that as by Virtue of the Union he has made Divine the Flesh he took, by a Sanctification which is naturally proper to him, so he would have the Eucharistical Bread (as being the true Image of his Flesh) be made a Divine Body by the coming of the Holy Spirit, the Oblation being by means of the Priest Transferred from a common Estate, to a State of Holyness: And therefore as the natural Flesh of Christ indued with a rational Soul, was anointed by the Holy Spirit, being united to the Divinity; so his Image, to wit, the Divine Bread is replenish'd with the Holy Spirit*. It is clear that they oppose the Sanctification which the natural Flesh of Christ has received by Virtue of the Hypostatical Union, to the Sanctification which his Image receives by the coming of the Holy Spirit. There, say they, the natural Flesh was Anointed with the Holy Spirit: Here his Image, to wit, the Bread is filled with the Holy Spirit. The Question then is concerning a Sanctification which the Bread receives in quality of the Image of our Lord's natural Flesh, and this Sanctification is the Grace of the Holy Spirit where-with the Bread is filled. The Sanctification which the natural Flesh has received, is not a Consecration which has changed the Substance of it into another;



another, but an inherent Sanctification which letting the Humane Nature subsist, has made it become a Source of Grace; the Sanctification likewise which the Bread receives, is not a Consecration which changes its Substance into that of another, but an inherent Sanctification in the Bread, which letting the Bread subsist makes it full of the Holy Spirit. We could not then better Translate διὰ τινος ἁγιασμοῦ ἑξῆς θεοῦ, than by these Words, *being made Divine by a certain Sanctification of Grace*. It will be to no purpose for Mr. Arnaud to wrangle about these Words, *The Oblation being Transferred from a common State, to a State of Holiness*, ἐν τοῦ κοινῆς πρὸς τὸ ἅγιον, as if they were to be Rendred, *from a common State, to a State of Consecration*; for here the Matter is touching a Sanctification, which is the Image of that which the natural Flesh has received. We must then Translate, *to a Holy State, or to a State of Holiness*. And the Latin Interpreter of the Council, who had not those particular Interests to maintain as Mr. Arnaud has, has faithfully turn'd it; *Oblationem de communi separans, ad Sanctificationem pertingere facit.*

I am sorry I have been forced to entertain the Reader with these grammatical Niceties, which I suppose cannot be very pleasing; but besides that Mr. Arnaud having charged me with a Falsification, I was obliged to justify myself: There will redound hence this Advantage, to wit, that the Sence of this Council will more plainly appear, and the solid Advantages we draw thence. They make two Bodies of Christ, the one his natural Body, th'other his Body by Institution; the one is his natural Flesh, th'other is the Image of his natural Flesh; the one a humane Substance, th'other a chosen Matter, namely the Substance of Bread; the one is Holy by a Sanctification which is naturally peculiar unto it, the other is raised from a common State to a State of Holiness; the one is the natural Flesh of Christ anointed by the Holy Spirit, the other is Bread indued with the Holy Spirit. There is not any thing in all this that can agree with Mr. Arnaud's Conceptions.

C. 7. p. 698. NO more then is there in the Fathers calling the *Eucharist*, *not a deceitful Image of Christ's Flesh*, in opposition to the Images which they called Deceitful. To understand rightly their Sence, we must suppose with Mr. Arnaud that they said the Images of their Adversaries were deceitful, either because they represented the Humanity separated from the Divinity; and subsisting by it self, (if it were said they were only Images of the Humanity, they leaned to the Error of the *Nestorians*) or because they represented the Divinity Confused and indistinct from the Humanity, if it were said they expressed our Saviour intire, thus they led to the Error of the *Eutychiens* who confounded the two Natures. So far Mr. Arnaud is not mistaken; but he has not been so happy in Discovering how they understood the *Eucharist* was not a deceitful Image. For it is certain that in respect of the Error of *Nestorius* their Sence is, that as the humane Substance in our Saviour had no personal Subsistence, so likewise his Image, to wit, the Substance of Bread, has not the Form and humane Figure of it, altho it seems that an Image should have them: So that by this it represented the humane Nature not as a Person, but as a Nature bereav'd of its Personality, and thus it differed from the Error of the *Nestorians*: Which is what they Express in these Terms; *As our Lord took on him the Matter only or humane Substance, without the personal Subsistence, so he has commanded us to offer an Image, a chosen Matter, that is to say the Substance of Bread, not having the Form or humane Figure.* And in respect of the Error of the *Eutychiens* they would have, that as the Body of Christ was not Abolished, nor Confounded with the Divinity, but Sanctified and made

Divine

Divine by means of the hypostatical Union; so the Bread is Sanctified and Deified by the Holy Spirit: Which is what they expressed by these Terms, *As by Virtue of the Union our Saviour deified the Flesh he took by a Sanctification, which is naturally proper to him; so likewise he would have the Bread in the Eucharist, as being not the deceitful Image of his natural Flesh, to be made a Divine Body by the coming of the Holy Spirit, the Oblation being by means of the Priest transferred from a common State, to a State of Holiness.* Now this does necessarily suppose that the Substance of Bread Subsists, to represent against *Eutychus* the Substance of the humane Nature in the hypostatical Union. Moreover this is not one of my metaphysical Speculations, as Mr. Ar- P. 669.  
naud is pleased to express himself; it is the Doctrine of the Fathers, and especially of those who disputed against *Eutychus*, and I expressly observed it, having for this effect cited *Fustin Martyr, Theodoret, Gelasius, and Ephraim of Antioch.* But Mr. Arnaud has thought good in relating my Words to cut off this Clause, for fear the Readers should see that the Sence I attributed to the Fathers of *Constantinople*, and which he is pleased to call a metaphysical Speculation of Mr. Claude, is in effect, a Doctrine commonly received in the Greek Church.

I drew Advantage from the Council's saying that our Saviour chose a Matter which does not represent any humane Shape, lest Idolatry should be thereby Introduced: And pretended that in whatsoever sort these Words were Understood, they were Inconsistent with the Belief of the real Presence. Mr. Arnaud Answers that this Passage is capable of three Sences. The First, That Lib. 7. c. 7.  
God would not let the Eucharist have a humane Shape, lest it should be adored. P. 700. 701.  
The 2d. That he would not suffer the Eucharist to have a humane Form, lest Men should commit Idolatry in Adoring it under this humane Figure, altho it be no Idolatry to Worship it under the Figure of Bread. The 3d. That he would not let the Eucharist have a humane Form, lest the due Worship which would be given it under this humane Figure, should carry Men forth to Adore Images of Wood and Stone, which being not our Saviour as the Eucharist is, could not be Worshipped without Idolatry. The first, adds he, of these Sences is that which the Calvinists give to the Words of the Iconoclastes. The 2. Is a ridiculous Sence, and that which never any Person yet Imagined. The 3d. Is the Sence which the Catholicks give them. Hereupon Mr. Claude to establish his first Sence, Declames at large against the 2d. which is not a Sence, but an absurd Imagination which he has form'd.

H A D Mr. Arnaud sincerely related all that I said on this Subject, and not maim'd my Discourse, and produced but some part thereof disjoynted from the rest, that he might turn it into a wrong Sence: It would have been easily perceived that I offered these two last Sences, and shewed that both of 'em were Inconsistent, with the Supposition of the substantial Presence. That I afterwards established the true Sence of these Words, in supposing the Eucharist to be an Image really distinct from our Lord's Body. I neither attributed to the Author of the *Perpetuity*, nor to any body else any Sence. I only proposed the two which might be given to these Words upon supposal of the real Presence, and shewed that neither of them were justifiable. I am not at all troubled at Mr. Arnaud's calling the Second an *absurd Imagination*; I hold it to be so as well as he, and as such I have refuted it. But the Last is no less absurd than the Second: For the due Worship which would be given to the Eucharist, if it had a humane Shape, would not induce Men to the Worshipping of Images of Wood and Stone. The Difference, would be apparent,

rent, for the *Eucharist* would be the Body of Christ, the Image of Wood not so: The Adoration of the *Eucharist* would not be then grounded on the humane Shape or Figure, but on the substantial Presence of Christ's Body. Moreover what can be more Ridiculous than the Opinion which Mr. *Arnaud* Imputes to these People, which is, that our Saviour would have proposed his Body really in the *Eucharist*, clothed with another humane Figure than his own natural Form: *Otherwise*, say's he, *it would not be an Image, but our Saviour himself without any Vail*. It is true, but this should make him comprehend that they understood the *Eucharist* was not the proper Substance of this Body, but an Image which is of another Substance than its Original. For a Man cannot be guilty of a greater Absurdity than to imagine our Saviour's Body is really in the *Eucharist* in a humane Shape, not his own, but a borrowed one. These kind of Imaginations reside not in the Minds of reasonable People. But supposing this was their Sence, how could they say that our Saviour would not take upon him any other humane Shape than his own to prevent Idolatry? Might not their Adversaries tell them on the contrary that this very Consideration ought to prevail on us the more to make Images? For the Original of our Saviour's Body, in whatsoever State it is, takes Men off from Images, but it would carry them further off from them if it had a humane Figure, whatsoever it were, for this is what our Eyes seek in Images, and if they found this Figure joyned with the Original, they need not search it elsewhere. I confess that the Original Speaking, Moving it self, and Acting under its own proper Figure, would better produce this Effect; but this does not hinder but that it may produce it likewise, having a simple borrowed Figure, without Speech and Action, seeing that also Images have neither Speech nor Action, and that the Figure they have is no less a borrowed Figure, than that which the *Eucharist* would have. It is certain that this sensual Devotion which seeks after Representations, and visible Lineaments, would be more satisfied in beholding a humane Shape whatsoever it were, applyed on the Original it self, than to behold one represented on Cloth, or the Walls of a House. It must then be acknowledged that the true Sence of this Council supposes the *Eucharist* to be an Image really distinct from the Body of Christ, and that our Saviour has chosen for this a Matter, or a Substance which has not a humane Figure, lest this Resemblance should carry Men forth to render to the Image that which is only due to the Original, and to make others like it, of other matters, to Adore them. Whosoever shall compare my Exposition with that of Mr. *Arnaud*, will soon acknowledge that mine is Natural, Free, and according to good Sence, whereas his is Forced and Violent, and imputes to Persons such a kind of Arguing as is absurd and groundless.

C. 7. p. 702. *BUT*, say's Mr. *Arnaud*, the Iconoclastes Adored the *Eucharist* with a sovereign Adoration: For Stephen the Younger said to Constantin Copronymus, Do not you design likewise to cast out of the Church the Antitypes of the Body and Blood of Christ, seeing they contain the true Image of them, and we Adore and Kiss them, and are Sanctified by receiving them? Stephen proves the Worship of Images by a Principle common to the Iconoclastes. Now according to them, all Worship rendered to Images is a real Adoration, and is due to God only, and consequently they gave to the *Eucharist* a Worship which they supposed due only to God.

*BUT* could not Mr. *Arnaud* foresee, that we may argue exactly contrary, and say Stephen proves the relative Adoration of Images by that of the *Eucharist*?



*charist.* Neither of them then gave the *Eucharist* any other than a relative Adoration, and consequently they neither of them believed, that it was the Body of Christ in proper Substance. But, say's he, the Iconoclastes acknowledged but one only Adoration, which is, that which is due to God alone, and consequently they gave the *Eucharist* a Worship which they supposed due only to God. <sup>Ibid.</sup> There cannot be a weaker Argument; Stephen does not only prove the relative Adoration of Images, by the Example of that which is given the *Eucharist*, but likewise by the Example of that which is given to the Cross, Sacred Vestments and Vessels. If Mr. Arnaud's Consequence be good, we must say likewise that the Iconoclastes rendred to all these things a Worship which they acknowledged to be only due to God alone, which is not easy to believe. It must then be necessarily acknowledged either that the Iconoclastes rejected not absolutely the distinction of the two Adorations; the one Absolute, and the other Relative, or that they acknowledged not the Honour given to the Cross, Sacred Vestments, and the *Eucharist*, was a real Adoration, and there is a greater likelihood in the last, than in the other. So that Stephen proves well the relative Adoration of Images, by the relative Adoration of the *Eucharist*, and other sacred things; but this is not by a Principle common to the Iconoclastes and their Adversaries, but only by external Ceremonies which were common to them both, and which were variously expounded by both Parties.

## CHAP. XI.

*Several Circumstances relating to the second Council of Nice, Examined.*

HAVING thus cleared the Sence of the Council of *Nice*, it's scarce worth our Enquiry, whether this Council was called and held in a regular manner; and whether its Conduct was so sincere, that there could be no Fault found with it. I grant it was assembled in the Year 787. ten Years after Stephen Stylitus's Death, if we refer our selves to the anonymous Author who wrote the Life of this Stephen; and do thereby acknowledg that according to the best Chronology it cannot be said, That after Epiphanius had censured in the Council of *Nice* the Terms of Figure and Image; Stephen Stylite notwithstanding said, will you cast out of the Church the Figures of the Body and Blood of Christ? Altho Mr. Blondel, (whom every body knows was very skilful in these Matters of Chronology) computed Stephen's Death to have hapned ten Years after this Council of *Nice* was held: Howsoever Mr. Arnaud knows very well that the Bill Epiphanius read, was not written before this Council was held, that it could not be seen by Stephen, and that the Clause therein touching the Rejection of the Term of Image in reference to the *Eucharist*, was not taken out of Damascen's Writings, who was Stephen's Contemporary, and a Patron of Images as well as he. Whence it follows that altho the Writing which was read in the Council condemned the Use of this Term, yet Stephen (who was engaged in the same Affair as the Author of this Writing) made use of it; which shews that this Doctrine, that the *Eucharist* is not an Image or Figure, was

neither the Doctrine of the whole Greek Church, nor even that of the whole opposite Party to the Council of *Constantinople*. Now this is the Substance of what I had to say, and to which Mr. *Arnaud* was bound to make reply.

IN effect it has not been *Stephen* only who made use of the Term of *Figure*, and believed it to be not Inconsistent with the Doctrine of the Greek Church in reference to the *Eucharist*; *Balsamon* who lived in the twelfth Century did the same likewise. The thirty second Canon, say's he, of the Council called in *Trullo* Injoyns the unbloody Sacrifice, be made with Bread and Wine mingled with Water; because the Bread is the Figure of Christ's Body, and the Wine the Figure of his Blood. *Andrew* of *Crète*, as *Goar* Reports, scrupled not to say, That our Saviour is Immolated in the Symbols which are the Figures of him; *ἡ εὐχαριστία ἐν αὐτῇ τοῖς συμβόλοις*. And *Nicetas Pectoratus* writing against the *Latins* in the eleventh Century, likewise said, You eat the Azyme of the Jews as a Figure of our Lords true and living Flesh; And again, If as you say the Apostles received an Azyme from our Lord, and delivered it to you as a Figure of our Lord's Body, to be the Mystery of the new Testament, &c.

BUT to return to the Council of *Nice*, it is granted 'twas *Tarasus* who (before he accepted of the See of *Constantinople*,) obtained a Promise from the Empress *Irène* that there should be a Council called; but this does not hinder but it may be said, That he was not settled in this See till he had obtained from *Irène* the Convocation of this Synod. But whether it was at his Request or not, that *Irène* did it, it little matters; for it is still certain they were agreed in it; and this Condition on which he is said to accept of that See; shews only that he was far engaged to maintain the Cause of Images, and already became a Party. Mr. *Arnaud* cannot deny that *Tarasus* had already declared himself in the Letter he wrote to Pope *Adrian*. Neither can he any more deny the Pope answered him he would not consent to his Election to the Patriarchate, unless he Re-established the Worship of Images. All this is expressly contained in *Adrian's* Letters, and thence may justly be concluded that this Person was not at his own Liberty when he presided in this Council, and could at farthest be considered only as the Head of a Party, which was at that time the strongest, as being upheld by the Empress *Irène*, and her chief Minister *Stauracius*. Now this by good right makes void whatsoever *Tarasus* did afterwards.

MR. *Arnaud* cannot deny but that the two Monks *Thomas*, and *Fohn*, whom the Council ever called *The Vicars*, or *Representatives of the Apostolical Sees in the East*, were sent by some Hermit of *Palestine*, and not by the Patriarchs of *Antioch*, *Alexandria*, and *Jerusalem*, nor by the Consent of the Patriarchal, or other Churches. Whence it appears this Council could not rightly call it self Universal, nor be preferred above that of *Constantinople*, altho so esteemed by the Author of the *Perpetuity*, who tells us as a considerable Matter, that all the Patriarchs were there present.

Lib. 7. c. 3.  
P. 715.

IT was, say's Mr. *Arnaud*, a mere Favour of the Council towards them, to give them the Place of the Patriarchs. If it were a mere Favour of the Council, then the Presence of these Men ought not to be made a Ground for the calling this an œcumenical Council; and by this means to give it the greater Authority. The Author then of the *Perpetuity* had no reason so loudly to proclame,

proclame, that all the Patriarchs were present at it. For it is Absurd to pretend the Patriarchs assisted at it, under Pretence there was given by mere Favour the Place of Patriarchs to two Religious, who had neither Order nor Mission from these Patriarchs. *Yet this Favour*, adds Mr. Arnaud, *was* <sup>Ibid.</sup> granted on good Grounds, seeing no Persons could better supply this Place, than those that were competent Witnesses of their Sentiments, and were the Bearers of their Synodical Letters. But to keep in a Council the Rank of Patriarchs, it is not sufficient for Persons to be Witnesses of their Sentiments, nor Carriers of their Synodical Letters, which the Patriarchs wrote to one another, they must be their Deputies sent expressly for this; and 'tis to no purpose to say no Persons could better hold this Rank than they, for nobody absolutely could hold it, neither they nor others, seeing they were no Deputies; to grant a Favour to People on these slight Grounds, to take afterwards upon 'em the Title of œcumenical Council, and to boast of the Presence of the Patriarchs, this was not so much to Favour them, as to Impose upon us.

*TARASUS* the Patriarch of Constantinople sent Deputies towards the others Patriarchs, but these Deputies returned without executing their Commission, because they saw the Danger they were in from their Voyage. *It is false*, say's Mr. Arnaud, *that the Consideration of their own Danger was the Cause of these Deputies Return*, for they on the contrary protested they were ready to venture their Lives to acquit themselves of their Charge, and were only deterred upon the account 'twas represented to them, they exposed the whole Church to Danger: But Mr. Arnaud falls into a Passion without any Occasion. He was never yet told as I know of, that the fear of their own personal Danger occasioned their Return: But only, *They understood it was not safe for them to Travel to and fro to the Patriarchs of Antioch and Alexandria, because of the Suspicion which Aron the Sarracen King, who governed almost the whole East, would conceive at their Voyage, which put them upon the Resolution of Returning.* The Hermits Letters of Palestine contain that the Deputies, *Were willing to venture their Persons; but it being shewed them that in hazarding their Lives, they endangered likewise the Peace of the Church, they desisted for this Reason.* It is then certain that the Danger which made them resolve upon returning, respected their Persons, which is precisely what I said. Whether this was for Fear, or out of respect of the Trouble which might thereby happen to the Church, I did not affirm; and therefore Mr. Arnaud had no reason to charge me with Falstiy.

Answer to the  
2d. Treat. of  
the Perp. 3. p.  
c. 4.

*IT is false*, say's he again, *that being resolved to return they assembled these Religious, seeing on the contrary these Religious who were gathered together persuaded them to return*: This is still wrangling about a Trifle. When we perused this Relation, we were not so curious to inquire whether their Resolution to return preceded the Assembly, or whether it was the Assembly that advised them to it. The Letters Inform us, that they immediately met with two of their old Friends, to whom they discovered themselves, that those Friends joyfully Received them; *But Concealed 'em for fear of the Enemies of the Cross, that being discreet they would not make known their Arrival, nor Counsel them to perform the Voyage they had undertaken.* So that here I think is the Design of their Return half Resolved upon, thro the Persuasion of these two Friends.

Ibid. c. 3.  
P. 716.

*IT is false*, say's Mr. Arnaud, *that they assembled these Religious after they understood the Danger there was in going to Antioch, and Alexandria; see-*  
ing



ing it was from these Religious that they understood it. The Care their Friends took in immediately concealing them for fear of the Enemies of the Cross, not daring to trust any Body with the News of their Arrival, nor to assist them in their Voyage, sufficiently convinced them of their Danger in going farther. Now this is set down in the Religious's Letters as a matter which preceded their Assembly.

*Ibid.*

*IT is false, say's Mr. Arnaud again, that these Religious were but five or six in number. This is a silly Fancy of Mr. Claude: For there was a great number of Religious then in Palestine, and therefore I see no reason why there should be no more than five or six assembled upon an Affair of so great Importance. But this is not so silly neither: For seeing the two Friends we now mentioned, were forced to hide the Deputies for fear of the Infidels, 'tis very likely they called no great Assembly for this Affair, how important soever it was. The Letter of the Religious informs us that these two Friends having secured the Deputies, hastned to the Religious, whom they secretly assembled, and Swore them first to keep secret the Affair they had to communicate to them. This I think sufficiently shews that the Assembly was but small, and could not exceed the number of five or six; for a numerous Assembly would not well agree with this great Fear and Secret.*

*THE Epithets of Idiots, and Persons of no Experience, which it pleases Mr. Claude to give them, adds Mr. Arnaud, have not any Foundation but in his unjust Passion; And this it is to be angry when a Man Writes. The Letter of the Religious assembled, tells us expressly, that having cast their Eyes on Fohn, and Thomas, to depute them to the Council, they ingenuously answered, And how can we who are Idiots, and Persons void of Experience, Ignorant, and Unable to mannage such an Affair. Ἰδιῶται καὶ ἀγνώστους ὄντες καὶ πρὸς τὴν ὑπόθεσιν ἀδυνάτους καὶ ἀμάρτυρους ἔχοντες, which the Latin Interpreter has well rendred, Idiota & inexpertes, & ad tantam causam infirmi & indocti: How can we undertake this Business which we are not able to mannage? To which the others answered, not that 'twas their Humility which made 'em thus express themselves; but, That our Lord made use of unlearned and mean Persons for the Reforming of the whole World, giving them Utterance, and manifesting his Strength in their Weakness. Now what Unjustice and Rashness have I been guilty of, in using the very Expressions of a Letter inserted amongst the Acts of a Council? Neither can Mr. Arnaud say these Monks spake thus only in mere Modesty, and that their Words are not to be taken in a strict Sence. For besides that the Modesty of learned Men does never proceed to this Excess, as to call themselves Ignorant and Unskilful Persons: 'tis to be considered the other Religious did not gainsay but that they were really such as they termed themselves: They Answer that God will manifest his Power by their Weakness. Is it then Rashness and Injustice in me to speak according to the Expressions of this Letter? Mr. Arnaud certainly might have found better Employment, than to fill up a whole Chapter with these Trifles, and to make such a pudder about them.*

*Lib. 7. c. 9.  
p. 722, &c.*

*Perp. of the  
Faith, 2. Part,  
p. 249, 250.*

*HE ought likewise to shew greater Sincerity than he has done, in undertaking to Justify the Translation of a Passage out of the Life of Luke the Anachorite, related by the Author of the Perpetuity in these Words, Stretching out a linnen Cloath, you must put the Sacred Particles therein, and burning Incense, sing Psalms, which Relate to, and Represent this Mystery, or else the Canticle usually called Trisagion, together with the Apostles Creed, and*

and *WORSHIPING* it thrice with bended Knees, and Hands lift up, you shall take in your Mouth the Sacred Body of Jesus Christ our God. I complained that this *Worshiping* is written in great Characters, was an Addition to the Greek Text, which only say's thus; *And bowing thrice the Knee, and joyning your Hands, you shall take, &c.* *Καὶ τρεῖς τὸ γένυ κλίνας τοῖς μὲν χεῖρεσ σου ἐπέλεις μεθεξῆς, &c.* Mr. Arnaud Justifies this Translation, and first he say's, That Mr. Claude may as well Reproach Bollandus, and Peter Combefis, who first Translated the Greek Words, which signify no more literally than bending the Knee, by these, *Trinaque genuflexione adorans*. To whom Mr. Arnaud may likewise add *Allatius* his great Author; for he also Translates *Trinaque genuum flexione adorans*: But neither do Bollandus, nor Combefis, nor *Allatius*, excuse the Author of the *Perpetuity*. He ought not to assert any thing in a matter of this Importance, without a careful Examination of it, for 'tis not the Examples of others that will excuse such kind of Faults as these. Moreover there is a considerable Difference between the Translation of Bollandus, Combefis, and *Allatius*, and that of the Author of the *Perpetuity*. They Translate, *Trinaque genuflexione adorans*: This *adorans* is an Addition to the Letter, and an Explication of what may be pretended the *genuflexion* signifies; but 'tis not a spoiling of the Sence, for 'tis certain that in this Occasion the *genuflexion* is an Adoration. Mr. Arnaud needed not Expatriate in long Discourses and Distinctions to prove it; We grant it. All that can be said in this Respect is, that Bollandus, Combefis, and *Allatius*, have rather performed the Office of Paraphrastists, than that of Translators. The Paraphrastists do not only Explain the Terms, but the Matters Represented by them: They enlarge upon Matters, and when two Notions are joyned together by any Dependence, they pass easily from one to the other; this is allowable in them. But Translators must be more exact, they must faithfully render the Expressions as much as the Idiom of the Language they Translate in will permit them. They ought especially to keep to the first Sence and Notion which the Letter gives them, and never take the Liberty to pass over from one Sence to another, or from one Idea to another, whatsoever Coherence and Dependence there may seem to be betwixt them: For this is not permitted them. A Paraphrastist may for Instance very well say on our Saviour's Words to Judas: *Dost thou betray the Son of Man with a Kiss, in doing him Homage, and shewing him Respect and Friendship*. This does explain that which the Kiss given to our Saviour does naturally Signify, and a Man passes thus from one Idea to another. But should a Translator pretend to this Liberty, it would be justly denied him. A Paraphrastist may make our Lord say, *I am the Spiritual and Mystical Light of the World enlightning others*. A Translator cannot; for altho this be the true Sence of the Word *Light*, yet 'tis a second and explicatory Sence, which is not exactly the first Notion which the Letter gives. We must say the same that when Bollandus, Combefis, and *Allatius* have Translated, *Trinaque genuum flexione adorans*: They were Paraphrastists, not Translators, and kept not the Character they took upon them: They cannot be excused by saying as Mr. Arnaud does, that *genuflexion* in a Matter of Religion is an Act of Adoration. For altho this be true, this is not the first Idea which the Letter of the Greek Text gives: *τρεῖς τὸ γένυ κλίνας* if rightly rendred, signifies no more than, *ter genu Flectens*. *Adorans* ought not to be added thereunto, this is Expounding, and not Translating, this is passing from one Conception to another, which is not a Translator's Business, and so much the rather, in that there was no Necessity to make this Addition, the Latin very well bearing that we should say *ter genu flectens*. It is to no purpose for Mr. Arnaud to say (as he does) that Combefis,

Answer to the  
2d. Treat. of  
the Perpetuity.  
2. part. c. 8.

*Allatius* in a.  
dendis ad lib.  
de Perpet. conf.

fis,

C. 9. p. 724. *fis, has done no more than the Evangelists did: For as to St. Luke's saying, That the leprous Person fell flat on his Face before our Saviour Christ: And St. Mark, That he kneeled down: And St. Matthew, That he worshiped him. Mr. Arnaud here Imposes on us as he is wont: St Mark, and St. Matthew were not Translators of St. Luke. The Evangelists are each of 'em Authors of their own Gospel, and there is a great deal of Difference betwixt speaking as an Author, and as a Translator. Had the Translation of Mons rendred these Words of St. Luke, kneeled down, or worshiped him, instead of falling on the Ground, it might be justly blamed; and that Man ill understands the Rules of Translation, who allows in himself or others this Liberty.*

P. 725. SO far concerning *Bollandus, Combefis, and Allatus*: But the Author of the *Perpetuity* did not think good to stop here: Besides the Addition of an Expression which is not in the Greek Text, he has proceeded to the altering the Sence in determining it. For he Translates, *And WORSHIPING is intending thrice the Knee, and with folded Hands, you shall receive into your Mouth the Sacred Body of Jesus Christ our God.* He has written this Word *Worshiping* in great Characters, to shew that thereon depends the Decision of the Question, as referring it self to the Body of Christ which we receive into our Mouths; that is to say, to the Sacrament it self. Th'others left it at the Readers Liberty to refer this Adoration to God, or our Saviour in Heaven: But the Author of the *Perpetuity* judged not this sufficient, and therefore would have it only relate to the *Eucharist*. Now this is an inexcusable Depravation: For what Right has this Author to add an Expression, and determine moreover the Sence of it, by an Article which hinders us from understanding it any otherwise than he pleases. Is it fairly done of a Translator whocites a Passage in a Dispute to deal thus. *It is apparent, say's Mr. Arnaud, that in this Passage these Genuflexions refer themselves to our Saviour Christ*: Which I deny, if by the Body of Christ he means the Sacrament; provided Mr. Arnaud can say, *it is Apparent, it is Clear, or it is False*, the Matter is decided, he has done enough. But why is this apparent? Is not there more likelihood on the contrary that these three Genuflexions respect the three Persons of the Trinity, to whom is sung the *Trisagion*? *This Answer is, again say's he, Ridiculous*; why Ridiculous? *Because, say's he, that singing of Psalms, or of the Trisagion, rehearsing the Creed, and folding the Hands, are several Parts of the whole Ceremony enjoined by the Bishop, all of which respect the Blessed Sacrament, and serve as a Preparation for its Reception, and not to one another.* It is true they all respect the Celebration of the Sacramental Action, and serve for a Preparation to the Communion; but that they all refer themselves to the Sacrament, that is to say, to the Object which is present before our Eyes, as so many marks of Reverence given to it; this cannot be truly said, for the *Trisagion* is adressed to the Holy Trinity, and not to the Sacrament. What also hinders but that the three Genuflexions may be made in Honour of the three Persons? Those that know the Temper of the Greeks, need not be told what great Lovers of Mysteries they are in all things, as *Combefis* does somewhere observe; *Græci, say's he, sunt valde mystici*; it is then very likely that the number of three in their Kneelings has a mystical Reason and refers it self to three Persons. But say's Mr. Arnaud, *It is not necessary to sing always the Trisagion, and when 'twas not sung, yet the three Genuflexions were made.* I grant it, the three Genuflexions then were not made to God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; this Conclusion is not good: Could they not think of the Trinity nor Worship it, but they must sing the *Trisagion*.

P. 726.



MR. Claude, say's Mr. Arnaud, must prove that these Terms of the Body of Jesus Christ, do not signify the true Body of Christ, before he can justly blame this Translation as False. Did ever any Man behold a more unreasonable Pretension? The Author of the Perpetuity shall bring in his Prejudication into his Translations, and add unto them what he pleases; and having thus accommodated them to his Sence, he may give 'em me for good and substantial Proofs, and I must not have the Liberty to charge his Translations with Falsity, till I have showed his Prejudications to be False. Is there the least Dram of Equity in this? After this rate Mr. Arnaud may Translate thus the Words of Christ, *This is my Body in proper Substance*; For this Translation is agreeable to his Prejudication, he may alledg them to me in this Form as a good and excellent Proof; and if I tell him his Translation is False, and that 'tis not thus in the Original, he may maintain against me that I have not the Liberty to charge his Translation as False, till such time as I have proved that the Term of Body, does not signify the Body in proper Substance: And the Laws of Controversie being as well for the Benefit of the one Party, as the other; I will render the same Words, *This Bread is the sign of my Body*; and producing my Translation as an express Proof of my Sentiment, I will likewise tell him that he must not Accuse my Translation as False, till he has proved that by the Term of Body, when the Question concerns the Sacrament, we must not understand the Sign of Christ's Body.

BUT, adds he, as this is an unjustifiable Pretension (to wit, the Pretension that the Term of Body does not signify the true Body) and is particularly confuted by all the Greeks of our time, in supposing the Words of our Saviour Christ signify the real Body of Christ, we have had reason to suppose that those of bending the Knee, signify a real Adoration: What weak Arguing is here? Suppose these three Genuflexions refer themselves to the Body of Christ which we receive into our Mouths; Suppose that by the Term of Body, we must understand the Body in proper Substance; Then Mr. Arnaud's Translation will be tolerable. There is so great Irregularity in all this, that the plain Repetition of it is enough to Confute it.

AND thus have we considered whatsoever Mr. Arnaud has proposed of any Weight in his seventh Book, and in his second, third, and fourth, touching the Greeks, to perswade the World that Transubstantiation is one of their Doctrines. We have met with several Delusions, and many Paralogisms, which are the two Characters of a Person that is deceived himself, and would have others to be deceived with him. He has not been sparing of his fruitless Histories, false Suppositions, starcht Prefaces, Amplifications, Exclamations, and in a Word, of any of the Artifices of Rhetorick; and that which is most strange, is, he has never less shunned the slipping into these Defaults, then when he has himself most unjustly accused me of them. I take no Notice of his Invectives, and Sharpness with which he has stuffed his Discourses to render 'em more taking and agreeable, nor of that common Custom of his, of taking in a contrary Sence the most solid Matters, to make them seem Ridiculous. All which has not hindred but that I have done the three things I took upon me to prove; The first to shew that altho it were true the Greeks believed Transubstantiation, it would not thence follow that this Doctrine has been perpetually in the Church. The other, That the Greeks do not in effect hold Transubstantiation, nor Adore the Eucharist: And the Third, That all Mr. Arnaud's Efforts to prove the contrary Proposition are Ineffectual,

al, and that the greatest part of his Proofs conclude directly against himself: The First of these has been established by solid Reflections on evident matters of Fact; The Second by good Proofs; And the Third by pertinent Answers, and most natural Consequences.

IT only remains now to be concluded from this whole Dispute, that Transubstantiation and the substantial Presence are in effect an Innovation of the *Latins*, and not the ancient Doctrines of Christianity, seeing they are not found established in the Greek Church. This Conclusion is as every Man may see directly opposite to that of Mr. *Arnaud*, but if compared together, it will be soon found that mine is drawn from my Principle with far greater Evidence, and Necessity, than the other follows from his. For, supposing the *Greeks* do believe the Conversion of Substances, it cannot hence follow that this Doctrine has been perpetually held by that Church, as we made appear in our second Book. But if they do not believe it, it is a plain sign that it was neither Believed nor so much as heard of by the two Churches before their Separation. If the *Greeks* do now at this day believe this Doctrine, having not done so heretofore, we cannot marvel thereat, considering their Condition (as it has been represented by us) since the eleventh Century, and the unwearied Pains the *Latins* have taken for the Propagation of the Doctrines of the Roman Church in the *East*; to which end they have used, and do still use all kind of Means. But supposing they believed it heretofore, it is hard to conceive they have ceased believing it, because it is naturally more Difficult for Men to give over believing what they did once Believe, than to begin to believe what they did not Believe, and because likewise the least Effect this aforementioned Commerce of the *Latins* with the *Greeks* could Produce, would be to Cherish and Preserve a Doctrine of this Importance amongst the *Greeks* themselves, and to hinder its being Lost.

---

*The End of the First Part.*

---

A N  
A N S V V E R  
T O

Mr. Arnaud's Book

INTIT'LED,

The Perpetuity of the Faith of the *Catholick* Church,  
touching the *Eucharist* defended.

P A R T II.

B O O K V.

Wherein is treated of the belief of the *Moscovites*,  
*Armenians*, *Nestorians*, *Jacobites*, and other Churches,  
called *Schismaticks*, of the belief of the *Latins* in the  
seventh and eighth Centuries, and of the Conse-  
quences which *Mr. Arnaud* draws from the pretend-  
ed Consent of these Churches, in the Doctrines of  
the real Presence and *Transubstantiation*.

C H A P I.

Of the *Moscovites*.

*That the Moscovites do not believe Transubstantiation.*

HAVING thus cleared up the Point in reference to the  
*Greeks*, I come now in order to the Examination of *Mr.*  
*Arnaud's* fifth Book, wherein he treats of the other Churches  
called *Schismaticks*, which are separated as well from the *Greek*  
Church, as the *Roman*. The first of those Churches which  
he Offers us is that of the *Moscovites*, and he immediately  
acknowledges that she makes up a part of the *Greek* one, and that the same



lib. 5. C. 1. p.  
423.

Proofs which serve for the one, suffice for the other. But this acknowledgment ill agreeing with the Design, he had to make this the Subject of four Chapters; he say's afterwards, *he thought himself obliged to treat of this at large, as well for that the Fallacious arguments which Mr. Claude makes thereupon, deserve to be represented; as that also, the Opinion of the Moscovites appeared to him very Considerable in this matter.* To speak plainly, these are meer frivolous Pretences, as it will appear in the sequel, and unless he imagined this Multiplication of Objects would contribute something to his Glory, and make it more Illustrious; there can be no reason alledged for the mentioning of the *Moscovites* apart, for if it be true these People profess to follow the Greek Religion, (as he say's;) as soon as ever we are satisfied of the Doctrine of these last, we need not trouble our selves any longer, concerning the Belief of the others. Yet we must accommodate our selves to Mr. *Arnaud's* method, and treat of the *Moscovites* seeing he will have it so.

Voyage into  
Moscovia, lib.  
3. p. 234.

Possessin Bibl.  
Sci. lib. 6. C. 5.  
and lib. de reb.  
Moscov. Thom.  
a Jesu. Lib. 6.  
C. 5. Olearius  
voyage Mosc.  
Lib. 3 p. 237.  
234.

TO begin with the state of these People; *Moscovia* is a great Nation professing the Christian Religion, but otherwise extream Barbarous and Ignorant of the Doctrines of Christianity. Some have questioned whether they may reasonably be called Christians; whereupon Mr. *Olearius* has Pleasantly say'd: *That it may as well be questioned whether they are Men, seeing their Religion does not so greatly differ from that of other Christians, as their Morals, and way of Living does from that of other Men; but as they shew themselves Men by speech, and Laughter, so in like manner they appear to be Christians by Baptism, and the outward Profession of the Christian Religion.* They refer themselves upon all Accounts to their Prince as to their Oracle, saying when they be asked touching any Point, *That God and their Great Czar know it, and that 'tis by the especial Grace of their Czar, they are in Health, and can sit on Horseback.* One of their Chief Maxims is to suffer no Preachers amongst them, and in Effect they have none, but content themselves with the reading of the Psalms, some Chapters of the Scripture, and S. *Athanasius's* Creed; to which they sometimes add an Homely of S. *Chrysostom*, or the Life of some of their Saints. Mr. *Olearius* adds, *That one of their Priests setting himself to Preach, and exhort the People out of the word of God to the duty of Prayer, the Patriarch depos'd him together with some other Priests who followed his Example; that he excommunicated them and sent them into Siberia,*

Possessin ubi su-  
pra.

THERE are neither Accademy's nor Colledges amongst them, and it would be a Crime punishable by the Laws of that Kingdom, for a man to apply himself to the study of Sciences. They have only some small Schools wherein they teach Children to Write and Read, and perhaps a little Greek and Latine in one Corner of the Kingdom.

Olear. Lib. 3.  
p. 234.

Olear. Lib. 3  
p. 237.

Possessin ubi su-  
pra.

Relation of  
the Ambassag-  
of the Earl of  
Carlile.

HENCE it is their Ecclesiasticks are so Prodigiously ignorant that Mr. *Olearius* tells us; *There is scarcely any amongst their very Monks and Priests that can give an Account of his Faith, because they have none to Preach the word of God to them. And therefore the Patriarch will not permit 'em to Dispute about Religion, nor inform themselves by means of Strangers.* *Possessin* likewise tells us, that demanding of their Monks who was the founder of their Order; not one of 'em could return him an Answer. And thus are we informed in the Ambassage of the Earl of Carlile: *The Religion of the Moscovites is the same which the Greeks profess, for they follow their Faith, Rights, and Ceremonies; but they are so Ignorant, that they scarce know themselves what Religion they are of.*

THEIR

THEIR Superstition is no less than their Ignorance, witness their calling their Images their Gods; saying when they enter into any House, *I est le Boch, where is the God?* Witness likewise their re-baptizing themselves every year, and not only their own Persons, but in like manner their Images and Horses. And their giving a Testimonial or Pass port in due form and manner to their Dead, attesting, *they have lived good Christians and observed the Greek Religion, to the end that S. Peter in seeing their Testimonial may admit them into Heaven.* Witness moreover that fabulous and impious Book, mentioned by *Olearius*, wherein they have corrupted the Historical passages of the Gospel, adding thereto filthy and abominable Circumstances, such as is this amongst others: That *Mary Magdalen* prostituting her self one day out of Charity, her Action was so Meritorious in the sight of God, that it expiated all her past sins, and caused her to be Canonized in the Register of Saints.

*Olear. Lib. 3. p. 261.*

*Olear. Lib. 3. p. 261.*

*Olear. p. 149.*

I could willingly forbear mentioning things of this Nature, did not I find that Mr. *Arnaud* in his Discourses concerning these People, seems to represent us with an Idea of the most happy and flourishing People in the World.

THIS is, say's he, a great Kingdom almost intirely separate from all others. This is a Nation which has ever had but little Commerce with the rest of the Nations of the World, few Persons Voyaging into those parts, and few Moscovites into Asia and Europe. There was never in this Country a mixture of Persons of divers Communions. It cannot be say'd the Latins have brought over their Opinions here by Croisados; and 'tis observed by all Authors that these People are exceeding careful to preserve their ancient Customs, and Doctrines. In fine, there is no Country in the World more tenacious of their Opinions, and which less easily admits a new one. The Church of this Kingdom is a Church purely Greek, and owes it's Conversion to the Greek Church, having received from her the Doctrine she Professes. There are scarcely any other Books read amongst them, than some Greek Fathers translated into the Slavonian Tongue. The writings of these Fathers are expounded amongst them; they have no other Sentiments than those which Nature imprints in their Minds. Will not a man be apt to say in reading this Description, that this Land is a kind of spiritual Canaan?

*Lib. 5. C. 1. p. 423.*

BUT what signifies disguising of things at this rate? Besides what I now related touching the Ignorance, and Superstitions reigning in this Church; we need only observe what judgment *Possevin* who lived several years in Moscovia makes of them. In respect of Schism, say's he, it cannot be imagin'd how deeply they are engaged in it, holding their Opinions for inviolable Maxims, or rather, adding still something to them, than abating any of them. It is the same with the Moscovites as with those who once have wandred from the Unity of a Principle, the forwarder they go, the more they multiply their Errors, just as may be observed in the Innovators of our times. The Moscovites having receiv'd their Schism from the Greeks have departed from 'em, and having no Books, nor Learning they therefore abound with impertinencies. And yet according to Mr. *Arnaud*, this is the only Country in the World for conserving a Doctrine already established, and the least likely to embrace a new Opinion. The same *Possevin* tells us that the Great Duke *Basil* having caused a Greek Priest to come into his Country, whom the Patriarch of Constantinople sent him, he threw him into Prison, and would not release him altho requested by the Turkish Emperor, because the Priest told him,

*Possevin. de reb. Moscov. p. 249.*

*Possevin. de reb. Moscov. p. 1.*

Ibid. p. 38.

Elucid. error.  
vitus. Rub.  
Joan. Sacra.

him, he found the *Moscovites* had erred from the Doctrine and Ceremonies of the Greek Church; and from that time, they had no more Recourse to the Patriarch of *Constantinople*, for his Confirmation of the Metropolitain of *Moscovia*. In another place, he observes expressly that they differ in several things from the *Latins*: Which caused *Sacranus* the Channon of *Cracovia*, to say, that they abuse in several things the Rights of the Greeks, and have been ever Reputed by the Greeks for Hereticks, which have departed from them. This proposition of *Sacranus* may be excessive, but it may be well concluded thence, that the *Moscovites* are indeed of the Grecian Religion, but, have not so carefully preserved it, but that 'tis alter'd in several things.

Posssev. de reb.  
Mosc. Com. 1.  
& 2 Chap. 4.

Paul Fov. Lib.  
de Legat Mosc.

Arnaud. Epist.  
dedicat. ad  
Sigism.

Posssev. Bibl.  
select. Lib. 6.  
C. 1.

Posssev. Bibl.  
select. Lib. 6.  
C. 1.

THIS pretended firmness which Mr. *Arnaud* attributes to them, has not hindred the Greek Religion, from being corrupted amongst them, neither has it hindred the *Latins* from using their utmost Endeavors, to introduce their Doctrines amongst them; nor *Possevin* from laying his Designs in Order thereunto. It has not hindred the Popes from sending their Emissaries amongst them, as I have already shew'd in the second Book, nor from making use of Merchants, who under pretence of Commerce obtain an easier access into these Countries, as appears by the History of *Paul Fovius*, nor *Arnaudius* a Latiniz'd Greek, from spending twenty years in *Lituania*, *Russia*, and *Moscovia*, in the propogating of the Romish Religion, as he himself testifies in his Letter, to *Sigismund* King of *Poland*, nor Seminaries from being set up in *Lituania* and other places, for the instructing of the *Moscovites* Children in the Romish Religion, as *Possevin* tells us. This firmness does not hinder, but that they have made use not only of *Polanders* for the Reduction of these People, who hold a particular Commerce with them, but especially, of the re-united *Russians* who appear less suspected to the *Moscovites*, because they observe still the Greek Rites. In fine this does not hinder the false *Greeks*, who having finished their studies in the Seminary at *Rome*, do return into *Greece*, from promoting the interest of the Roman Church, under the habit and disguise of Schismatical *Greeks*, and from passing over from *Greece* into *Moscovia* when occasion Offers, as appears by the Example of *Paysius Ligaridius*, who wrote in *Mosco* it self, his Treatise of the *Eucharist* in favour of Mr. *Arnaud*, and at the Solicitation of Mr. *de Pomponne*.

Posssev. de reb.  
Moscov.  
Comm. 1.

IS not this then a delusory Remark which Mr. *Arnaud* has made; That it cannot be alledged, the *Latins* have brought their Opinions into these parts by *Croisado's*? This is true, but if they have not brought them thither by *Croisado's*, they have done whatsoever they have been able in order to the introducing them by Missions and Seminaries, by Commerce of Merchants, by *Poland*, *Russia*, and *Greece* it self which is their Mother-Church. Now can it seem strange to us if with all these Machins, and by abusing the Ignorance and stupidity of these People, they have been made to believe that *Transubstantiation* is a Doctrine of the Greek Religion, and consequently one of theirs? And can it be imagined, we are such Fools to make our Faith depend on that of this People? What Mr. *Arnaud* adds: That there is scarcely any other Books read amongst them, than the Writings of some of the Greek Fathers translated into the Slavonian Language, does not well agree with what *Possevin* tells us, that they understand not any more of the Slavonian Language, than what nearly relates to theirs, or that of *Poland*. What signifies the reading of Greek Fathers Translated into a Language which the People understand not?

BUT let us see what kind of Proofs Mr. *Arnaud* brings to Convince us, that



that the *Moscovites* believe *Transubstantiation*. The first he Offers is the silence of all Authors, that have written on the Religion of this Church, who do not Remark that it differs in this Point from the *Romane*: To enhance the Value of this Proof, he Immediately complains that I have not alledged any thing that is Real and Positive, whereby to maintain my Thesis. *It is strange*, say's he, *that Mr. Claude treating of this Matter, should choose rather to devine the Opinion of these People on weak Conjectures, than to inform himself whether he might not meet in so many Books, that mention the Religion of the Moscovites, real Proofs of what he would willingly find.* He afterwards reproaches me with my Negligence in not reading those Books, and Protests he has not been guilty of the like, having read whatsoever he could find written on this Subject, eight Authors on one side, several Treatises on the other, such as *Possevin, Baronius, Raynoldus, Botter, Breerwood, Hornbeck*, and several others.

Lib. 5<sup>to</sup>. l. 2.  
425.

T H E R E is no need of this Account. There being no body as I know of that questions Mr. *Arnaud's* industry; we on the contrary blame him for taking so much Pains for nothing. As to my own part believing as I do, that the World do's not much concern it self, whether I am Diligent or Lazy, I shall not make this a matter of Debate, only say, that Mr. *Arnaud* with all his Reading will be no less perplexed than my self, how negligent soever I am, should either of us be put upon the producing of the Testimony of one single *Moscovite* Author, that expressly mentions *Transubstantiation*, either one way or other. If then by real Proofs, he means passages of the *Moscovites* themselves, I beg of him to shew me who are the Authors of this Nation, that have treated of the Mysteries of Christian Religion, for excepting the Letter of *Fohn* the Metropolitan of *Moscou*, which *Sigismond d'Herberstein* has published together with the Canons of another *Fohn*, and the Answer of *Niphon* Bishop of *Novograd*, I know none that have written about Religion, or any thing else, and these three Pieces aforementioned, are but five pages of Paper in all. But if by these real Proofs Mr. *Arnaud* means the Testimonies of those who have described the Religion of these People, his Complaint has no grounds. We have already told him that Travellers, and those that make Discourses of distant Nations, give us seldom any other than a general Relation of their Opinions, without descending to Particularize what they hold or reject. So that there can be nothing certainly concluded from the silence of these Authors.

Sigism. Com.  
rer. Mosc.

I T is to no purpose to say, that in the Comparisons they make of Religions, it is always with the Roman Catholick Religion, that they Compare all others, and that in this Comparison, the Principal differences are designed to be marked out. For supposing they all of 'em took this Course, it is certain they must reduce all these Principal differences, to those which spring from an expresse and actual Opposition, wherein on one hand the *Roman* Church professes to believe such a Point, and the Church which is compared with it, professes on the contrary to oppose and reject it. So that we must not wonder if those that have discoursed of the Religion of the *Moscovites* have observed, that they hold as fabulous the fire of Purgatory, acknowledge not the Authority of the Pope, Communicate under both kinds, and give the Communion to Children, and yet have not observed that they do not hold *Transubstantiation*. These Points are openly controverted between the *Greek* Church of which the *Moscovite* makes a part, and the *Latine*, but that of *Transubstantiation* is not so. They do not teach it, neither yet do they make thereof a point of Controversie.

Lib. 5. c. 1.  
P. 427.

I F

IF there can be any advantage drawn from the silence of these Authors it falls to me. For being most of them *Roman Catholics*, and knowing well the Importance of this Article, and how greatly controverted in our Western parts, there is no Likely-hood if they had found it held, established, and taught amongst the *Moscovites*, but they would remark as much, on purpose to gratifie in this the *Roman Church*, and indeavour to clear it from the reproach of Innovation; neither must Mr. *Arnaud* imagine, that he is the only Person that had in his Eye the Schismatical Churches for the defence of the controverted Points in our *Europe*. These aforementioned Authors are not wanting to tell us of the Devotion which these People have for Images, the worship they give their Saints, their Prayers for the Dead, their fastings, Monks, Confession, extream Unction, and in a word of all particulars wherein they are agreed with the *Roman Church*, and are contrary to the Protestants. How then comes it to pass they have forgotten that of *Transubstantiation*? It is to no purpose for Mr. *Arnaud* to say, that they do not particularly Remark the Articles of the Trinity, the Incarnation, touching the Death of Christ, nor the others in the Creed, for besides that this is not absolutely true, there being some of these Authors, who declare the *Moscovites* hold *Athanasius's* Creed, and the seven first Councils, and consequently the Doctrine of the Trinity, the Incarnation, &c. Besides this I say, these Articles are not debated between the *Romanists* and *Protestants*, as the others are, and especially that of the Conversion of Substances.

*Ibid.* p. 426. BUT say's Mr. *Arnaud*, we will shew Mr. *Claude* that they are not all of *em* silent on this Point, there being some that clearly affirm the *Moscovites* hold *Transubstantiation*. Which we are to Examine. He tells us then, that *Paulus Fovius* having observed they reject Purgatory, and disown the Popes Supremacy, and follow the *Greeks* Ceremonies, makes a general Conclusion concerning all the other Articles, that they hold the same as we do: *In ceteris Eadem, quæ a nobis de Religione sentiuntur constantissime credunt.* I think, adds Mr. *Arnaud*, that the Real presence and *Transubstantiation* are Articles important enough to be comprehended under this general Proposition. Were this a right consequence it would likewise follow hence, that the *Moscovite* Priests do not marry no more than those of the *Latins*, for *Paulus Fovius* say's nothing of that. It would follow they baptized not with three Immersions, and hold all other Baptism to be of none Effect, for *Paulus Fovius* does not remark this. Neither does he any more take Notice, that they reject the Confirmation of a Bishop, hold fasting on Saturday to be a great Crime, abhor the eating of Creatures strangled, and yet these Articles are as important in respect of the *Moscovites* as any others, seeing they make them principal Controversies, not being able to bear with them that are of contrary Opinions. Mr. *Arnaud* must not be so quick at drawing Consequences, or imagine that *Paulus Fovius* has been so exact in all that he has written concerning the *Moscovites*. For he tells us, they have St. *Ambrose's* works, St. *Austin's*, St. *Ferom's*, where St. *Gregory's* translated into the *Slavonian* Tongue, and highly respect them; and *Possevin* the Jesuite tells us, that having made an exact inquiry into this particular, he could find no such thing, neither believes the Name of these Authors is known to these People, altho those of St. *Ambrose* and *Gregory*, may be seen in their Kalender, and that at the Princes Court, he could hear nothing of this.

*Paul Fovius*  
*Com. de legat.*  
*Mosc.*

*Possevin Com.*  
*1. de reb. Mosc.*

*SACRANUS* a Chanon of *Cracovia*, adds Mr. *Arnaud*, who gives us the

the largest Catalogue he could of the Errors of the *Moscovites*, say's touching the eighth Error. *That according to the Moscovites, the Body of our Saviour Christ cannot be Consecrated with Azymes*, and on the sixteenth Error. *That they cut a Morfel of the Bread prepar'd for the Sacrifice into the form of a Triangle, and Consecrate it to make thereof the Body of our Saviour Christ, in Corpus Christi consecrant, and in the eighteenth Error, Consecrant panem in Corpus Christi.* Lib. 5. c. 1. p. 431.

'TIS certain Mr. *Arnaud* makes a small matter serve for a Proof. The *Moscovites* Consecrate the Bread, in *Corpus Christi*, into the Body of *Jesus Christ*, or to be the Body of *Jesus Christ*. They believe then *Transubstantiation*; 'Tis evident for the Establisshing of this Conclusion, there is need of something more precise than this. But, say's he, *this is a Catholick that speaks thus, and who would be understood to speak of the real Body of Jesus Christ, that attributes this same Belief to the Moscovites.* When *Sacranus* or any other that professes the *Roman* Religion speaks as from himself, and the question concerns his own Faith, we can easily believe that in a Discourse of the *Eucharist*, by the Body of Christ, he means the proper substance of this Body, for we know that this is the Sence, and Style of the *Roman* Church. But when he Discourses of the *Moscovites*, and the question concerns their Faith, we believe that in saying they Consecrate the Bread in *Corpus Christi*, he pretends no more, than to use the same Terms which the *Moscovites* use, without concerning himself with the Sense in which they take these words. They must be taken in the Sense the *Moscovites* give 'em. What Sense is that? This *Sacranus* does not determine, and to go about to decide it, by what *Sacranus* himself believed concerning the Sacrament is a meer Illusion. Ibid.

AS to what *John le Ferre* Confessor to the Arch-Duke *Ferdinand* relates, that the Consecration is performed amongst them, by pronouncing our Saviour's words, and that they attribute to them so great Vertue, that assoon as ever they are uttered by the Priest, they believe the Creature gives place to the Creator; we must tell Mr. *Arnaud*, that he does not do fairly in offering us a Fabulous relation, such as is this *le Ferre's*. This Author assures us, that only the Bishops amongst the *Moscovites* Administer Confirmation, that they do it by the laying on of Hands, in making the sign of the Cross, and anointing the Party Confirmed on the Forehead. That one of the chief Offices of the Priest is to Preach the Gospel of Christ to the People, which they do not only every Sunday; but also on the Festivals of the Blessed Virgin and Apostles. That God's Word is Preached and heard with great Devotion. That they certainly hold the Doctrine of Purgatory. Acknowledge the Supremacy of the *Roman* Prelate, as being Christ's Vicar, and St. Peters Successor. That they freely assist at Mass with the Latins. This is all false, as appears by other Relations of these People. Moscovit. Religions. And therefore *Possevin* has not scrupled to reckon this *John le Ferre* amongst those Authors, which are counted fabulous, because, say's he, they have been mis-informed, or did not write with a Design to discover the Venom, to apply thereunto a Remedy. What signifies then such peoples Testimony. Possevin Com. 2. de reb. Mosc.

NOT to take notice that these Terms, *The Creature gives place to the Creator*, are not sufficient to make us conclude from hence *Transubstantiation*. It being a general Expression capable of divers Senses. For when we should say with *Theodoret*, that the Divine Grace accompanies Nature, or with St. *Augustin*, that the Bread becomes of an Aliment a Sacrament, or with the *Greeks*, that it is changed into the Vertue of Christ's body, the Creature will still



give place to the Creator without any Conversion of substance. So that howsoever we take *Fohn le Ferre's* Testimony 'tis invalid; and does not at all help Mr. *Arnaud's* Cause. But he having made a general Collection of good and bad Authors, *Fohn le Ferre* must have his place amongst the rest.

I Confess that *Lascius* the Polander that relates this Testimony, has taken it in the Sence of *Transubstantiation*, and as we need not doubt but that the Design of *Fohn le Ferre*, was to make the World believe that the *Moscovites* hold this Doctrine, so likewise we must not find it strange if those that refer themselves to his Authority, as *Lascius* has done, do take it no otherwise. Had *Lascius* well examined this Relation of *Fohn le Ferre's*, he would have found it full of false Reports, and easily find his Authors main Design was to render the *Moscovite* Religion, as Conformable as he could to the *Roman*; and by this means to deceive his Readers, and especially, the Protestants whom he had at that time in his Eye. He would then have absolutely rejected the Authority of such a Man, who has palpably disguised the Truth: He might at least distinguish in respect of the Words in question, *Ferre's* Sence, from the Sence of the *Moscovites* themselves, supposing they were their own Words. But this he has not done, altho he ought to have done it, and thence it is that on this bare Testimony without any other Proof, *Lascius* has believed that the Opinion of the *Moscovites* leaned towards *Transubstantiation*. Whence it follows, we ought not lightly to Credit whatsoever a suspected Author shall tell us, concerning the Religion of Strangers, but it does not follow 'tis true in the main, that the *Moscovites* believe the Conversion of Substances.

WE must then come to the Testimonies of *Dannaverus* professor of *Strasburg*, and Mr. *Olearius* the Duke of *Holstein's* Library-Keeper; Persons of greater Reputation. Both say the *Moscovites* hold *Transubstantiation*: They put, say's *Dannaverus*, into the Wine contained in the Chalice, the Bread broken into pieces; they Bless it, and believe 'tis *Transubstantiated*. They hold *Transubstantiation* say's Mr. *Olearius*. So that here we have two exprefs Testimonies, and against which it seems there can be nothing alledged. As to *Dannaverus*, he has only followed *Olearius's* Authority, knowing no more of the Religion of the *Moscovites*, than what he has receiv'd from the reading of Authors, as appears by his Treatise. But as to Mr. *Olearius*, he is a Person of great Learning, and has lived in those Countries, and made it his Business to be informed of this Point, and who not only gives us this Account in his Book, but has likewise Confirm'd it, in a Letter written to one of Mr. *Arnaud's* Friends upon occasion of this present Dispute, and Mr. *Arnaud* has not failed to make thereof a matter of Triumph.

*Perpe.* of the  
Faith Part 3.  
C. 8.

Lib. 5. C. 3.  
P. 438.

IT will be no hard matter to reply to Mr. *Olearius's* Testimony, and clear it from all Perplexity. And this will be done by considering his own Words, as well in his Book as Letter. Those in his Book as the Author of the *Perpetuity* relates them, from the Original High-Dutch are, They believe *Transubstantiation*, that is to say, that the Bread and Wine are really changed into the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ. Those of his Letter related by Mr. *Arnaud*: I wrote expressly in the Relation of my Voyage, that the *Moscovites* hold *Transubstantiation*, that is to say, they believe the Bread is changed into the Body of Christ, and the Wine into his Blood. Distinguish then Mr. *Olearius's* Testimony, from his private Judgment, and you'll clear the Difficulty. His Testimony is, that the *Moscovites* believe the Bread and Wine

Wine are changed into the Body and Blood of Christ which he has denoted by these Terms, *which is to say that they believe the bread to be changed into the Body of Jesus Christ, and the Wine into his Blood.* His private Judgment is that this may be termed the belief of Transubstantiation, which he signifies by these following words. *They hold Transubstantiation.*

SO that the whole of this Testimony amounts to no more than the change of the Bread into the Body, and the Wine into the Blood, and his saying that they believe Transubstantiation has no other grounds than his own perswasion that this is in effect a conversion of Substance. He does not attribute this to them but under the favour of his *that is to say, They hold Transubstantiation*, says he, *that is to say, the Bread is changed into the Body of Christ, and the Wine into his Blood.*

THIS *that is to say* explains what he means, and punctually determines what the *Moscovites* hold. If to *change* and *transubstantiate* are one and the same thing, his Proposition must be received in its full extent, if they are not, the *Change* belongs to the *Moscovites*, the *Transubstantiation* to the private sence of *M. Olearius*. We then respectfully receive his Testimony without the least question of his sincerity; but as to his particular Judgement, we hope he will be so equitable as to lay no necessity upon us to receive it. For should we judge otherwise then he has done he will have no just cause to be angry. Neither had he any reason to be offended at the Answer I made the Author of the *Perpetuity*. *That 'tis very likely he was mistaken by false conjectures, and that having heard of the change of Bread, he imagined this was the change of Substance, which is the same thing I say now.* The distinction which I make between his Testimony and his Judgment is grounded on his own proper Terms, and the liberty which I pretend to have of rejecting the one and receiving the other is no more than what common Justice will allow me. I can therefore see no reason for his stuffing his Letter with rough and passionate expressions, which agree not well with the Character he bears, and which I suppose he has learned of the barbarous People he has so long conversed with. Why would he have us believe, the change of Bread into the Body is the Transubstantiation of the *Latins*, seeing we find on the contrary that this is the μεταβάλλειν of the *Greeks*, of which expression we have so often already manifested the sence; The *Moscovites* follow the Greek Religion we grant, the *Greeks* say the Bread is changed, the *Moscovites* affirm the same, the Question is only whether *to change* is the same as to *transubstantiate*. Now I have plainly displayed the difference betwixt these two Terms in reference to the *Greeks*; we must then conclude the same in respect of the *Moscovites*. It appears from *M. Olearius* his own Relation what we are to conclude touching his exactness. For in the same place where he tells us the *Moscovites* believe Transubstantiation, he adds, *that the rest of the consecrated Bread serves for Panis Benedictus.* Now this would be a great impiety to make this the proper Substance of the body of Christ, but even in this he is mistaken, for what serves amongst these People for *Panis Benedictus* is only the Remains of the Bread from whence is taken the great Particle which is afterwards consecrated and called the Body of Jesus Christ, and not the Remains of the consecrated Bread.

BUT to oppose against the private Judgment of *M. Olearius* something yet more precise, I need only here relate what the Author of the Relation

Relat. of the  
Ambas. of  
M. Carlile

of the three Ambassages of M. Carlile wrote on this Subject. 'Tis the Testimony of an Honorable Person, who lived a considerable time in those parts, and since M. Olearius, who wanted neither Judgment, Sincerity, nor Curiosity to inform himself and us touching the belief of these people, in reference to *Transubstantiation*, without the least regard to the Dispute between Mr. Arnaud and myself, as having no other design then that of discovering the Truth. Moreover, says he, *I could not find by 'em what Olearius mentions, namely, that they hold Transubstantiation: and there are three Reasons inducing me to believe they are not of this Opinion. For first, when we discourse with them, touching the Consequences of this Doctrine, they testify their dislike of it: and to maintain it, fly not to the Almighty power of God as the Roman Catholicks do. 2. 'Tis more then probable that if they believed Transubstantiation, they would respect this Mystery more than they do, and it would be very strange that in so superstitious a Religion as theirs is, they should be behind hand in Zeal and Devotion, especially in a particular wherein it ought chiefly to appear, as we see it does amongst those of the Church of Rome. In fine, had they that Opinion which Olearius attributes to them, they must have it from the Greeks from whom they have received their Doctrines. But we do not find the Greeks were of this Opinion. Let Mr. Arnaud then himself judge whether he may reasonably expect to prevail by means of Mr. Olearius his Explication.*

WE come now to the Testimony of *Paysius Ligaridius*, but having already considered it in the foregoing Book, we shall trouble our selves no farther with him. 'Tis not to be doubted but the same thing may be done in *Muscovia* as in *Greece*, that is to say there may be persons brought in and settl'd there who finish'd their Studies in some of the Seminaries erected for this purpose. 'Tis certain whosoever shall address himself to these Persons (who are not only bred up in the Church of *Rome*, and sworn to observe it's Confession of Faith, but sent on purpose to communicate it to others, prevailing by means of their Ignorance) whether soever they be, whether in *Muscovia* or *Greece*, their Testimony shall not be wanting. But every body knows the Value of them. Let us pass on then to the *Moscovite* Priest, that accompanied, not long since the great Dukes Ambassador to his Majesty of *France*, who after Dinner, as 'tis say'd, at the Arch-Bishop of *Sens*, was desired to declare what the *Moscovites* held concerning the *Eucharist*. There may be several considerable Reflexions made on this Relation; but not to enter into particulars, I say the Testimony of this Person is not sufficiently Authentick to decide our Question. We have already seen by Mr. Olearius his Relation that the *Moscovite* Priests are so ignorant in general that there is scarcely any amongst them can give an account of their faith, or knows the Religion professed in other Countries. These are two Characters that do not well agree with the use which Mr. Arnaud would make of this Priest. For to determine whether *Transubstantiation* be an Article of the *Moscovite* Religion, it ought to be known on one hand what it is the *Latins* call *Transubstantiation*, what they say and believe of it, and on the other, what the *Moscovite* Religion asserts touching the *Eucharist*. 'Tis no hard matter to make an ignorant Priest that speaks of a change of Bread into the Body of Christ believe that he acknowledges a *Transubstantiation*. But not to wander from the point in hand, there is all the likelihood in the World that that which passed at the Arch-Bishop of *Sens* is a meer Illusion. To judge of it we need only attentively consider the Expressions of the Relation which Mr. Arnaud has produced. After Dinner they withdrew into the Arch-Bishops Chamber



Chamber, where we began to Discourse them touching the different Customs of their Church, touching their Patriarchs Communion with the other Greek Patriarchs, concerning Fastings, Celibacy, Prayer, their Liturgy, &c. But in fine the Arch-Bishop desirous to come to the main Point of which he was most desirous to be informed, prayed the Interpreter to tell him word for word what he was going to demand; having laid this strict charge on the Interpreter, he desired them to tell him their Opinion concerning the Sacrament of the Eucharist. The Moscovite Priest answers without the least hesitation (which a little surprized us, for he had hitherto stood as it were upon his Guard, as if he had feared the engaging too far in some point of Controversie, lest he might thereby endanger his Reputation) That it was the real Body and Blood of Christ, and that after the Priest had uttered these words of our Saviour, this is my Body; the Bread is changed into the Body of Christ, and having said the same in respect of the Cup, the Wine is changed into his Blood. When the Interpreter had said this, the Arch-Bishop bad him tell him exactly word for word what the Priest had told him. The Interpreter told the Moscovite Priest what the Prelate desired, whereupon he repeated the same words the second time by the Interpreter. And forasmuch as he expressed that the Bread and Wine were transubstantiated into the Body and Blood of Christ, he was asked whether the Moscovite Priest used a word which in his Language had the force of that of Transubstantiation in ours. He replied, yes, and repeated the Moscovite word which signifies this, in looking on the Priest and Secretary, who both of them made Signs that this word was proper in their tongue and signified a change of Substance.

THE result of this Discourse is 1. That the Priest said 'twas the real Body and Blood of Christ, and that the Bread was changed into the Body of Jesus Christ, and the Wine into his Blood. 2. That he repeated only the same words the second time. 3. That the Interpreter added, that the Bread and Wine are transubstantiated. 4. That it was the Interpreter that professed the Moscovite word had the force of that of Transubstantiation. 5. That for a farther Confirmation, touching the force of the Word, he required the Priest's and Secretary's consent by a bare look, without speaking to them. 6. That the Priest and Secretary answered him by a sign without speaking. 7. That this sign signified this word was proper in their Tongue and signified a change of Substance.

IT is to be observed that this Interpreter was a Monk, not of the Moscovite Religion, but the Roman; and of the order of Jacobins, and that he explained in French what the Moscovites said in his Language, and in Moscovit what M. the Arch-Bishop of Sens said in French, for the Moscovites understood no more the French, than the French the Moscovit. Upon this remark which is beyond controul, for 'tis a matter of Fact well known throughout all Paris, I desire Mr. Arnaud to tell me why this Interpreter having returned the Answer of the Moscovite Priest, which he twice repeated in the same Terms without any Alteration, when he had I say given it in these words, the Bread is changed into the Body of Jesus Christ, and the Wine into his Blood, wherefore did he add that the Bread and Wine were transubstantiated? Wherefore when he was asked whether the Priest used a Word which in his Tongue had the force of Transubstantiation, did he demand by a bare look the consent of the Priest and Secretary to the Yes, which he answered, seeing the Priest and Secretary who understood not French, neither understood the Transubstantiated which he added, nor the Question put to the Interpreter, nor the Yes, he answered? Do they in Muscovia speak by signs or. were they

they agreed before-hand that this look should signifie *transubstantiated*? How could the Priest and Secretary answer to that which they did not understand, why by signs, and why must this sign which answered a very obscure Question, signifie *Transubstantiation*? Certainly we are but sorry people here in the West in comparison of these *Moscovites*, that can treat of one of the most important Articles of Religion by signs and nodd, without knowing the point in question; had Mr. Arnaud and I learnt this Secret our Dispute would not be so tedious. Now if this be not delusory I know not any thing that I can call by that name.

'TIS certain the *Moscovites* profess to follow the *Greek Religion* although they have in some sort altered it. Which I told the Author of the *Perpetuity*, and this I did not assert upon light grounds, although Mr. Arnaud is pleased to say I did; seeing I said no more than what he himself acknowledges. This is a common Principle to us both, 'tis true, we draw hence different consequences, but as matters are now stated and cleared, any man may easily judge which of us two has best grounded his Sentiment.

Answer to the  
P. 3. C. 8.

Lib. 5. C. 4.  
P. 448.

Joan. Lazic.  
Relig. Arm.

I said likewise that *Lascius* affirms the *Armenians* although they deny *Transubstantiation*, yet do reverence the Sacrament more religiously than the *Russians*; whence I drew this Conclusion, that 'twas not likely the latter of these who are more cold in their Devotion should extend their Belief farther than the others, and that the others should have more respect for a Substance of Bread than these should have for what they esteemed the proper Substance of the Son of God. I know not what could oblige Mr. Arnaud to say, That it is scarcely to be imagined how many *Disguisements* and *Falsities* there are in this Argument. I designed no more by all this than the drawing of a just Consequence from a True Principle. 'Tis certain that *Lascius* say's two things, the one that the *Armenians* of *Leopolis* deny the Bread and Wine lose their Nature, *In Sacramento Eucharista elementa Naturas suas amittere negant*. These are his words, the other that they reverence the Sacrament more religiously than the *Russians*, *Sacramentum religiosius Russis venerantur*, these are also his words. Whence I conclude 'tis not likely the *Russians* or *Moscovites* believe *Transubstantiation*, the reason is sufficiently evident, to wit, that those that believe the Sacrament to be the proper Substance of the Son of God, cannot but shew it more Respect than those that believe it to be a Substance of Bread.

Lib. 5. C. 4.  
P. 448.

IT is to no purpose for Mr. Arnaud to say, that my Argument supposes according to this Author, the *Armenians* do neither hold the real Presence, nor *Transubstantiation*, and that if I do not suppose this, nothing can be less reasonable than my Discourse. For if the *Armenians*, adds he, together with the Substance of Bread do moreover admit the real presence of Christ, it is no wise improbable but that they have a greater respect for the Eucharist than those that do not admit this Substance of Bread. The respect of the Eucharist comes only from the Presence of Christ: and the presence or absence of the Bread contributes not any thing thereunto.

I hope Mr. Arnaud will not be offended if I tell him that his Authority is not yet great enough in the Church of Rome to counter-balance that of *Thomas Aquinas*. Now *Thomas* his Doctrine is directly opposite to his, *Contrariatur*, say's this Author, *venerationi hujus Sacramenti si aliqua Substantia*

*Substantia creata esset ibi que non posset Adoratione latræ adorari.* 'Twould be contrary to the Veneration due to this Sacrament, were there any created Substance in it to which may not be given the adoration of Latræ. Now let any man if he can make this agree with what Mr. Arnaud says: Mr. Arnaud's Proposition say's that the respect due to the Eucharist proceeds only from the presence of Christ, and that the presence or absence of the Bread does not at all contribute thereunto, and Thomas assures us on the contrary that if the Substance of bread were present, it would hinder the Adoration of this Sacrament, whence it follows according to him, that those that hold the Substance of Bread ceases to be, ought more to reverence the Sacrament than those that believe it remains. So that whether the Armenians do or do not believe the real presence this signifies nothing to my Argument. 'Tis clear according to Lascius that they do not believe Transubstantiation, and consequently 'tis clear according to Thomas Aquinas that they hold an opinion which is contrary to the veneration of the Sacrament, yet do they adore the Sacrament more religiously than the Moscovites. How then can the belief of Transubstantiation be attributed to the Moscovites, for if they held this Doctrine they must have a greater veneration for the Sacrament than the others. This Argument cannot be otherwise denied than by opposing the Doctrine of Thomas Aquinas. So that with drawing my self out of the Lists I shall offer in my stead either Saint Thomas to be handled by Mr. Arnaud, or Mr. Arnaud by Saint Thomas, that is to say, the Master by the Disciple or the Disciple by the Master.

Thom. Sum.  
2. Part.  
Quest. 75.  
Art. 2.

MOREOVER our Question touching the Moscovites relating only to Transubstantiation, 'tis evident it would be a Digression from the Point in hand to discuss the intire passage of Lascius to know whether he imputes to the Armenians the belief of the real Presence. It will appear by what we shall say in the following Chapters what we may judge of them touching this particular. The Question now concerns only the Moscovites; and what Lascius says concerning their worshipping less religiously the Sacrament than the Armenians is uncontrollable, considering the testimonies we have produced in the second Book, of Sacranus a Chanon of Cracovia, John de Lasco Arch Bishop of Gnesne, and Scarga the Jesuite; who expressly depose that the Russians of whom the Moscovites are a part, do indeed adore the Bread before its consecration, but afterwards shew it no respect nor veneration, scattering the Crums thereof on the ground. It is to no purpose for Mr. Arnaud to say that that which hinders them from giving the Eucharist after consecration an external honour is, that the Consecration is performed in a place separate from the people, and that 'tis out of respect to the Sacrament that the People are deprived for some time of the sight of this Mystery 'Tis evident these are mere Subterfuges. Did they worship the Sacrament with an internal adoration, they would declare as much themselves, and ease Mr. Arnaud of the trouble of searching their Secret thoughts. They would shew it by some expression of external Reverence, and for this effect expose the Sacrament to the Eyes of the People, the People would at least make profession of adoring it before they received it, and the Priests would adore it in the Sanctuary when they had consecrated it. Yet do these Authors absolutely say that they give it no adoration. This, says Mr. Arnaud, is not so, for Oderbornus tells us that the Priest comes from the Sanctuary and walking leisurely shows the People that which he has consecrated in secret: that then the People fall down on their Knees the Priest saying to 'em in the Moscovit Language, Behold the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ whom the Jews

Lib. 5. C. 1.  
Pag. 432.



Jews unjustly put to death. But we have shewed in the third Book when we treated of the Adoration of the Sacrament that *Oderborn* is apparently mistaken, having taken a Ceremony which is used before the consecration of the Bread, as if it were used after this Consecration. The *Moscovites* even as the *Greeks* do but once shew the People the Bread and Wine, taking one turn round the Church before the Consecration, which they call the great Entrance. If Mr. *Arnaud* knows not this he is ignorant of a Matter well known by others, and if he does know it, he shews little sincerity, in designing to prevail over us by means of *Oderborn's* mistake.

## CHAP. II.

### Of the ARMENIANS.

*That the Armenians do not believe Transubstantiation: First Proof taken from that the Armenians believe the Humane Nature of our Saviour Christ was swallowed up by the Divinity.*

Lib. 5.  
C. 5.

WE shall not here particularly treat of the *Melchites* or *Syrians*, as well for that Mr. *Arnaud* acknowledges, they differ not at all from the *Greeks* in their Religion; as that likewise what he alleges concerning them out of the Notes of *Abraham Echellensis Maronite* on the Catalogue of *Caldean* Books made by *Abed-Jesu* a *Nestorian* Bishop, deserves not our consideration. The Testimony of *Abraham Echellensis* is of no credit, and I refer my self thereupon to *Gabriel Sionita* his Country man who has set him forth as an ignorant and impertinent Fellow, a Lye and Impostor. These two persons had both of them their Education at *Rome* in the Seminary of the *Maronites*, both endeavouring to advance the *Roman* Interest, but falling out about the Edition of the Bible in *Syriack*, *Gabriel* thought himself obliged to tell *Abraham* his own and publish his defects, he therefore puts forth a small Book which he calls, *Commonitorium Apologeticum*, wherein he represents him in the aforementioned manner. He reproaches him with his dividing the whole Seminary at *Rome*, for his treachery to the Patriarch of the *Maronites*; imposing on Prince *Fachraddin*, for cheating the Duke of *Florence*, and with his being banished his own Country, his Imprisonment at *Florence* for his Crimes, and in fine threatens him for the compleating of his shame to Print those Letters he received from Mount *Liban*, *Rome*, and *Florence* which give an Account of his Life. But besides there is not any thing in these passages but may well agree with the Hypothesis of the *Greeks*, such as we have shewed it to be in the two foregoing Books as will appear to him that shall take the pains to read them in Mr. *Arnaud's* Book, and apply to them the Answers I made to several other

other such like passages, which are needless here to be repeated.

WE E must come then to the *Armenians*, I shall insist the longer upon them as well for that Mr. *Arnaud* has discoursed much about them, as for that they are a great people, and an entire Church by themselves. They are long since separated from the *Greek Church*, and there is a deadly feud betwixt them in reference to Religion. Yet are they both extream ignorant of the design of Christianity, and the ignorance of the *Armenians* surpasses that of the *Greeks* as appears from the Testimony cited in my second Book. I will add that of the Bishop of *Heliopolis* in his relation printed at *Paris* 1668. *I gave, say's he, a Visit to the Patriarch of the Armenians near the City of Hervian in a famous Monastery of Eutychian Hereticks who are no less obstinate than ignorant. I found there amongst others a certain Person who having been in Poland had some smatterings of Latine, I would have discoursed with him touching the Principal Heresie of Eutichus, but he cunningly avoided it. I left this Monastery little satisfied with these Religious, who show little Piety, although they profess much, and live austerely.* So *Cyrellus* Patriarch of *Constantinople*, describing in one of his Letters to *Wytenbogard* the four Sects of Eastern Christians, with which the *Greeks* held no communion, to wit, the *Armenians*, *Coptics*, *Maronites*, and *Jacobites*, say's amongst other things, *that they live like Beasts, and are so prodigiously Ignorant that they scarce know what they believe themselves.*

*Relat. of Missionarys and Voyage of French Bishops by M. Francis Pallu. Bish. of Heliopolis.*

*Epist. Viror. Eruditor. Epist. a. Cyrell. ad Wytenbog.*

THE *Latins* have long since used their utmost power to bring over these *Armenians* to 'um, and submit them to the See of *Rome*. They have for this purpose sent Missions which they have renewed, or augmented as Occasion required. They have taken the course of Seminaries, and from time to time accordingly managed the Interests of Princes and Kings of *Armenia*, and that not seldom with Success. So that as there are at present two sorts of *Greeks*, the one called the reunited ones, and the other Schismatics; so there are likewise two sorts of *Armenians* the one that acknowledges the Authority of the Pope called *Frank-Armenians*, for in the East they call all the *Latins* of whatsoever Nation they be *Franks*; the others those that acknowledge only their own Patriarchs, or *Catholicks* as they term them, and are called only *Armenians*.

OUR Question only then concerns these last, and to know whether they do, or do not believe *Transubstantiation*. The first Argument I offer for the maintaining the Negative which I affirm, is, that *Transubstantiation* is inconsistent with the Heresie of *Euthyches* of which the *Armenians* make profession. They hold there is but one single Nature in *Jesus Christ*, which is the Divine, that the humane Nature was mixt or confus'd in the Essence of the Divinity. How then is it possible that having this Opinion they can at the same time believe the Substance of Bread to be changed into the Substance of the Body of *Jesus Christ*? For if our Saviour *Christ* has no longer a Body, if the humane Nature do's no longer subsist according to them, this would be to charge them with the greatest Absurdity, that is to say, a manifest contradiction, to imagine they believe the change in Question; seeing to believe it, it must be necessarily supposed, not only that our Saviour *Christ* has a Body, but likewise that his Body is distinct from the Divinity.

Lit. 5. C. 6.  
P. 454.

MR. Arnaud who saw the Force of this Argument would prevent it by two Answers, which we must distinctly examine one after another. The first amounts to this, *That supposing the Armenians were real Eutychiens, yet do's it not thence follow that their Opinion is inconsistent with Transubstantiation, or that they do not admit it after their Fashion.* For although they say there was but one Nature in our Saviour Christ after the Union, and that the Human Nature was swallowed up by the Divine, yet do they assert that the Virgin Mary brought forth a Son that appeared to have a Body like other men; that the Apostles conversed with our Saviour as a man, that the Jews took him for a man, that they crucified him as a man. Whence he concludes that this swallowing up of the Humane Nature consisted rather according to the *Eutychiens*, in the change of all the Natural proprieties which they called Nature, than in the annihilation of Nature it self taken for the Substance and internal being. That this manifestly appears by all their Writings who have undertaken to refute the *Eutychiens*, and by the *Eutychiens* themselves. For the *Gajanites* who are *Eutychiens* at farthest distance from the *Catholicks*, yet acknowledge they receive in the holy Communion the very Body and Blood of *Fesus Christ* the Son of God, and who was incarnate, and born of the Virgin Mary the Mother of God.

APPLYING this afterwards to the Question of the *Eucharist*, he say's, that they believe with all other Christians, that this same *Fesus Christ* born of the Virgin, seen in the World, crucified, and risen, is really present in the *Eucharist*, that the Bread is really changed into this *Fesus Christ*. But denying as they do, that the Body of *Fesus Christ* was a distinct Nature from the Divinity, so they will not allow the Bread which is transubstantiated into *Fesus Christ* to be any other Nature than the Divinity, that is to say, a deified Body, a Body mixt and confus'd with the Divinity by the loss of it's natural Proprieties rather than of it's Substance. Mr. Arnaud do's likewise promise us that in the Examination of what *Theodoret* has written he will more distinctly explain wherein consists this swallowing up of the Humane Nature according to the *Eutychiens*.

I know not what elucidations he may one day give us, but if they be no better then what he now tells us, they will be of no great use, for 'tis certain there was never a more crude discourse than that which he now gives us: First, What signifies the telling us that the *Eutychiens* acknowledged the Virgin Mary brought forth a Son that appeared to have a Body like other men, that the Apostles conversed with him, as with a man, and that the *Jews* took him for a man? what signifies this to the proving that they did not deny the inward substance of the Humanity remained in *Fesus Christ*, but said only that all the natural Proprieties which they call Nature was changed? There would be more likelihood in concluding from hence the contrary, viz. that according to the *Eutychiens* the inward Substance was changed, and the natural Proprieties remained; for if we really distinguish these Proprieties, from the Substance, it is immediately on them and not on the inward Substance, whereon depends ones being a man, and being taken for such. So that Mr. Arnaud in saying the Apostles conversed with our Saviour as a man, and that the *Jews* took him for a man, establishes a principle which not only concludes nothing of what he pretends but rather the contrary, which does shew in my opinion that he was in great perplexity when he wrote this Chapter. 2. Do's he not know that the *Eutychiens*, and especially



especially the *Armenians* when they are urged by passages of Scripture which attribute to our Saviour Christ all the out-ward Characters of a real Man, that he was born, conversed with his Apostles, eat and drank, was dead and risen again, that his Soul was oppressed with sadness, &c. whence we conclude he had a real humane Nature, answered, that all these things happened only in appearance, and that it was the Divinity it self that assumed all these External Forms, which yet had in themselves no reality: Pope *John* the second speaking of the Doctrine of the *Eutychiens*, *We confess*, say's he, *that the Holy Virgin is properly and truly the Mother of God incarnate and born of her. I say properly and truly to the end it may not be imagined that he took of the Virgin a Phantasm or not real Flesh according to the Doctrine of the impious Eutychiens. The followers of Eutyches and Dioscorus*, say's *Harmenopolus*, *affirmed the Son of God was made man in appearance, having only one Nature. Nitephorus Callistus confirms the same thing. The wretched Eutyches*, say's he, *did indeed acknowledge God to be born of the Virgin Mary, and that the Virgin was the Mother of God, and so far his Doctrine is sound and true. But he likewise held that the Flesh of Jesus Christ was feigned, that the Word was changed and made Flesh after an immutable manner, that he feigned in appearance the whole Oeconomy of our Salvation, and that whatsoever of corporeal appeared in him was only a Phantasm and Fiction. The same thing appears in respect of the Armenians from the Information which Pope Benedict the twelfth gives us of their Errors. For the twenty eighth Article has these words. The Armenians knowing not what answer to give the passages of the Gospel which assert our Saviour had a real humane Body after his Resurrection, forasmuch as they affirm that at the moment of the Union the Humane Nature was converted into the Divinity, answer that the will of God as it pleased wrought all these things, by which it seemed he had a Humane Body, altho in effect he had none. And in the following Article. Altho the Armenians hold that after the Union there was only in our Saviour Christ the Divine Nature into which the Humane Nature was converted, yet they say, and hold that the Divine Nature so depended on the will of Christ, that he did with it what he pleased. Cyrillus in his Letter to Witembogard relates he held a conference with one of the chief of the Armenian Doctors named Barsabas, in the Temple of Jerusalem, before all the people, and that the Subject of their Dispute was, Whether our Saviour Christ conversed with men, and died in appearance only κατὰ φαντάσιν, because adds he, The Armenians believe he suffered death κατὰ φαντάσιν, in appearance and not really. The Jacobites who are Eutychiens as well as the Armenians say likewise the same thing on this Subject according to the Relation of Fohn Cotorvic. They affirm, say's he, that the Flesh which Christ took was not of the same Nature as ours, and that the Word was not changed into true Flesh but into I know not what seeming and phantastick Flesh, and that he rather seemed to be a man, and born and aye than really to do so. So that they teach that all the Mysteries of our Salvation, the Incarnation, Passion, Resurrection of Jesus Christ, his Ascension into Heaven, and his second coming are bare Semblances and Appearances, and by this means make all these Mysteries meer Illusions. This is the true Opinion of the Eutychiens. So far are they from giving Mr. Arnaud Reason to conclude that they conserve in Jesus Christ the inward Substance of the Humanity, that on the contrary it appears they have only recourse to these vain appearances to defend themselves against the passages of Scripture by which is proved against them the Reality of the Humane Substance in this Divine Saviour.*

Epist. Joac. 2.  
Episcop. Rom.  
ad Aric. Ec.  
Bibl. Patr.  
Tom. 4. edit. 4.

Harmenop. de  
Sect. Arc. 5.  
Nitephor.  
Callist. hist.  
Eccles.  
Lsb. 18 C. 48.  
Raynald. ad  
an. 1341.

Cyrl. Epist. 21  
ad Witemb. in  
Epist. viror.  
eruditor.

Itinerar. Hier.  
& Syria Austr.  
Joanne. Cotor-  
vico. Lib. 2.  
C. 6. P. 203.

III. WERE their Sentiment such as Mr. *Arnaud* supposes it to be, how comes it to pass they have never declared as much? Whence is it they have ever say'd the humane Nature was swallowed up by the Divine, that it was changed into the Divinity, mixt and confus'd with the Divinity, without ever minding to clear up this difficulty in saying that by Nature they understood not the inward Substance, but only all the inward Proprieties, and that they confessed this Substance remained intire? How comes it that those who disputed against them, or that have related their Errors never made this pretended Distinction of Mr. *Arnaud*, nor declared this new Sence in which the word Nature is to be taken, to wit, for all the natural Proprieties, distinct and really separate from the inward Substance? Whence is it that Mr. *Arnaud* having so sharply inveighed heretofore against the Equivocations of the *Greeks* and *Latins*, now thinks fit to admit a perpetual one between the *Orthodox* and *Eutychiens*, the one taking the Term of Nature in one Sence, and the other in another, and disputing so many Ages against one another without explaining themselves and understanding one another? For it does not appear from Authors that wrote against the *Eutychiens*, that they took in this occasion the term of Nature for the Natural propriety in opposition to the inward Substance, as it pleases Mr. *Arnaud* to suppose without proof. It appears on the contrary that they have taken it for the Substance it self with it's Proprieties. If the humane Substance, say's *Gelasius*, has ceased to be, the Humanity having been transfused or intirely changed into the Divinity as they imagine, it follows that the humane form having no longer it's proper Subject has ceased to be likewise. And in another place of the same Treatise. If they do not deny, say's he, that *Jesus Christ* was real man, it follows he remained naturally in the Propriety of his Substance, for otherwise he would not be real man. When you say, say's *Vigilius*, that the Word and Flesh are but one only Substance it seems that you insinuate there are two Persons in our Saviour Christ. And a little farther, If the Word and the Flesh are one and the same Substance according to your Opinion, there would be two Persons, one of the Word, and the other of the Flesh, who would have one and the same common Nature. *Theodoret* disputes in the same manner against them by supposing they affirmed that the Humane Substance was swallowed up by the Divinity, and he concludes his Argument taken from the *Eucharist* in these words, The Body then of *Jesus Christ* keeps it's first Form, Figure, Circumscription, and, in a word, it has the Substance of a Body. *Euthymius* hereupon relates a passage of *St. Maximus* which expressly asserts, that *Eutyches* confessed the Unity of the two Natures, but denied they differed in Essence, introducing a confusion of Natures. Even Cardinal *Perron* himself altho a great Zealot for *Transubstantiation*, acknowledged this truth; that the *Eutychiens* held, the humane Substance ceased to be in our Lord *Jesus Christ*. For he say's that the *Orthodox Christians* maintained against the Hereticks that this Substance remained, because the Form, Figure and Circumscription of Body which could not be in our Saviour Christ without the natural Substance was to be found in him. Whosoever believes Mr. *Arnaud* must acknowledge the World has been grossly mistaken in imagining that the *Eutychiens* abolished the Humane Substance in our Saviour Christ when they say'd the created Nature was swallowed up in the Abyss of the Divinity, whereas according to him by the term of Nature they meant only the Natural Proprieties. And it must be moreover acknowledged that the *Eutychiens* have been to this day very blind in not discovering

*Gelas. Episc.  
Rom. advers.  
Eutych. &  
Nestibid.*

*Vigil. Lib. 5.  
contra Eutych.*

*Theodoret  
Dial. 2.*

*Euthym.  
Parop. Tit. 20.*

*Du Perron of  
the Euch.  
Lib. 2. C. 12.*

discovering this mistake in the Orthodox Christians, and very uncharitable in not endeavouring to undeceive them by a means which would cost them so little. But to speak better, It must be acknowledged that Mr. *Arnaud* is no such great enemy to Equivocations, for when he has need of them, he can well dispence with them, how terrible and dreadful soever he has made them in other occasions, wherein he believed it was his interest to establish there could not be any such between the *Latins* and *Greeks*.

IV. AS to what he tells us concerning the *Gayanites* from the Relation of *Anastasi*us *Sinaite*, that they did howsoever acknowledge we receive in the Communion, the very Body and Blood of *Fesus Christ the Son of God incarnate and born of the H. Virgin Mary the Mother of God*, there is far greater reason to say that by this Body they meant a Mystery which represented the Body swallowed up by the Divinity, than to say they meant his very Substance. For if what Mr. *Arnaud* say's of them be true that they were *Eutychiens* farthest off from the *Catholicks* in their Opinions we now saw that the *Eutychiens* believed not that this Substance subsisted distinct from the Divinity. Why then shall we not expound what *Anastasi*us *Sinaite* makes the *Gayanites* say, by what good and considerable Authors relate of the *Eutychiens*, rather than to give the lye to these Authors, and correct what they say by the Discourse of such an impertinent Person as *Anastasi*us, whom Mr. *Arnaud* himself has been forced to despise in citing him, as appears by what we have seen in the preceding Book?

THUS have I refuted Mr. *Arnaud*'s first Answer. Let us see whether there be any more Strength in his second. It consists in maintaining that the greatest part of the *Armenians* were but half *Eutychiens*; that is to say, they did not in any wise admit the confusion of Natures, that they condemned *Eutyches*, and that their Error consisted only in their refusing to use the Expression of the two Natures, asserting our Saviour had but one.

THIS is a Question of fact which must be decided by the Testimony of Authors. We shall see hereafter who are those that Mr. *Arnaud* alleges in his favour. We must only here observe that he unjustly exclaims against *Euthymius Zigabenus* a Greek Monk, and one *Isaac* a Catholick of *Armenia* who have attributed plainly and harmlesly the Error of *Eutyches* to the *Armenians*; So that at present we shall lay aside the Authority of these two Persons, seeing he is pleased to except against them, and betake our selves to other Witnesses for the ending of this difference. Here are others then which are not to be contemned, whether we regard their number or quality. The first is a Greek Author named *St. Nicon* who lived in the seventh Century. There is in the *Bibliotheca Patrum* a Letter or a Treatise of his under the Title, *De pessimorum Armeniorum pessima Religione*. He exactly enough describes in it the Errors of this Nation, and amongst others mentions this, that they hold the confusion of the two Natures of *Fesus Christ*, in the Union. *Itidem*, say's he, & in duarum Christi Naturarum Unionem confusionem decernunt. He say's likewise they hold the Divine Nature is possible, that being fallen into the Error of the *Aphartodocites* they believe the Trinity has suffered; and altho they durst not openly explain themselves, yet they do plainly intimate it by the things they do, for they take three Crosses, and fastning them to a Stake call this the Holy Trinity. Now here is (according to Mr. *Arnaud*) a third Impostor, that falsely accuses the *Armenians* to believe the confusion of Natures. He must be excluded as well as *Eutyches* and

Lib. 3. C. 8,  
P. 455.

Lib. 3. C. 6,  
P. 456.

St. Nicon  
Epist. ad Eu-  
chysium. Bibl.  
Patr. Tom. 3.  
edit. 4.



and Isaac; but if Mr. Arnaud continues in this captious humor he will never want exceptions against Authors.

Nicephor. Cal.  
hi. t. Ecclef.  
Lib. 18. C. 53.

TO *Nicon* we must add *Nicephorus Callistus* a famous Historian amongst the *Greeks*; who speaking of these same *Armenians* refers the original of their Heresie to one *Jacob* the Author of the Sect of the *Jacobites*; and adds, sometimes they say the word assumed an incorruptible Body, uncreated, heavenly, impassible, subtile, which is not of the same Substance with ours, yet has all the Accidents of Flesh, in appearance and after the manner of a spectrum. Sometimes likewise they affirm the Flesh of the Word was converted into the Nature of the Divinity, and became consubstantial with it. They do for the most part deny the Word assumed a humane Body of the Virgin, and say that having been changed without a Change, and made Flesh he has only passed through the Virgin, and fastned his Divinity to the Cross; and altho it be neither finite nor circumscribed yet he has deposited it in the Sepulchre. They deny the Birth of Christ according to the Flesh, affirming it hapned in appearance only. In the Celebration of the Eucharist they use the Azyme and not Bread. They put no Water in the Chalice, designing to represent thereby that there is but one Nature in Jesus Christ; whereas we by the mixture of Water with Wine, represent the Union of the two Natures. It cannot be more clearly affirmed that the *Armenians* are real *Eutychiens*, seeing he not only attributes to them the believing that the humane Nature was converted into the Nature of the Divinity, but made consubstantial with it: But he is too a terrible Calumniator, if we believe Mr. Arnaud. Howsoever let us proceed.

Guido Carmel summan  
de hæref. de  
hæf. Arm.  
C. 22.

*GUY Carmus* wholived about the year 1340. and has exactly reckoned up the Errors of the *Armenians* in his Book of Heresies; expressly tell us they follow the Opinions of *Dioscorus*, denying with him the two Natures of Jesus Christ, to wit the Divine and Humane, in the Unity of Person. That they admit only one Nature in Jesus Christ, that is the Divine; one Will, and one Operation. And in the twelfth Error he remarks They held that after the Union, the Humane Nature was converted into the Divine; so that as there is but one Person in Jesus Christ, so there is but one Nature in him, to wit the Divine, and that they cruelly persecute those that hold there are two Natures in Jesus Christ, the Divine and Humane.

Raynald. ad  
an. 1341.

IN the year 1341, the then Pope caused this Information to be drawn up, touching the Errors of the *Armenians* which we have already mentioned, and shall have farther occasion to discourse of hereafter. The second Article has these words, That there was held heretofore a Council in Armenia, wherein assisted the Catholick, that is to say, the Patriarch of the *Armenians*, with their Bishops, Doctors, and the Patriarch of the *Suriens*. That in this Council was rejected the Council of Chalcedon, especially because it had determined we must believe there are two Natures in Jesus Christ; to wit the Humane and the Divine, and one only Person subsisting in two Natures. That the Council of the *Armenians* had on their side determined, that as in our Saviour Christ there is but one only Person, so likewise is there in him but one Nature, to wit the Divine, one only Will, and one Operation; that they anathematized those that affirmed the contrary, and persecuted them not only by imprisonments, and loading them with Chains, but even to the putting them to death. That in this Council they had condemned Pope Leo and his

Letters

Letters to the Fathers of Chalcedon, and Flavian the Patriarch of Constantinople, because he asserted therein two Natures and one Person, two Wills and two Operations in our Saviour Christ. That in fine they Canonized Dioscorus whom the Council of Chalcedon had condemned, and the Armenians celebrated his Festival three times in a year as a Saint; and cursed Leo and the Council of Chalcedon which had condemned Dioscorus. The twentieth Article bears, That the Armenians believe and hold, that the Eternal Son of God begotten of the Substance of the Father, has united to himself the Humane Nature, and was made man, yet in such a manner that, in the Union, the Humane Nature was converted into the Divine Nature; and as there was after the Union but one Person in Jesus Christ, so is there but one Nature in it, to wit the Divine and not the Humane, That they curse all those who say the contrary; so greatly detesting those that hold the two Natures in Jesus Christ after the Union, to wit, the Divine and humane, that if any Baptised Armenian amongst them sayd this, they would not communicate with him; but esteem him as a Heathen; and upon his Return to the faith of the Armenians, rebaptise him neither more nor less then if he came from Paganism; and after this second Baptism lay twenty years Penance on him. And in the twenty first Article. The Armenians believe and hold that because after the Union of Natures in Jesus Christ, the Humane Nature was converted into the Divine, in such a manner that from that very moment there was only the Divine Nature in him, the Divinity has been passible and impassible, mortal and immortal, according as our Saviour himself pleased, and that thus he has suffered and is dead in the Divine Nature because he would, having no humane Nature when he suffered and dyed. Do's Mr. Arnaud imagine we shall rest contented when he shall tell us, that all these things are meer impossibilities?

EUGENUS IV. instructing the Armenians in the Council of Florence sufficiently shews he takes them for real and perfect Eutychiens; for he chiefly apply's himself to shew them the decisions of the Council of Chalcedon, and teach them that our Saviour Christ is consubstantial with us, and having took on him a real humane Nature, this Nature has subsisted, and do's still subsist, in the hypostatical Union, without confusion or conversion. We need but read this Discourse to find that it's drift is to oppose against the Errors of the Armenians, the contrary Doctrines which must be held to be conformable with the Church of Rome; and that one of the principal points he designed to insist on, was that of the two Natures in Jesus Christ, against the Heresie of Eutyches. And this is the opinion of Mr. Sponde Bishop of Pamiez. He do's not give them, say's he, in his Decretals, all the Articles of the Christian Faith, but contents himself (as I take it) with those wherein they erred, or of which they doubted. And first he gave them the Symbol of the Council of Constantinople, with the Addition of the Filioque, to have it sung in Churches, then the Definition of the Council of Chalcedon, touching the two Natures of Jesus Christ in Unity of Person. Thirdly, the Definition of the sixth Council touching the two Wills, and two Operations in our Saviour Christ. Fourthly, because the Armenians had acknowledged hitherto only the three first Councils that of Nice, Constantinople, and Ephesus, rejecting those that were held afterwards, he shews them that the Council of Chalcedon which they believed favoured the Nestorian Heresie, did as well condemn Nestorius, as Eutyches, and that they must receive it.

*Ad Calcedon  
Council. Florent.*

*Spondan. an-  
nal. Eccles.  
Tom. 2. ad  
Ann. 1432.*

Prateol. E.  
lench. Hæret.  
de Armen.

*PRATEOLUS* who made a Catalogue of all the Sects, say's, that 'tis easie to conjecture by reading of History why the Armenians have separated themselves from the Church. That 'tis because of the Council of Chalcedon, for this Council condemned Eutyches and Dioscorus whose Opinions they followed.

Cottovic. Itiner  
Hierof. et Syri.  
Lib. 2. de  
Armen.

*JOHN Cottovic* a Famous Traveller that relates what he learnt from the Armenians themselves, tells us, That the Armenians as well as the Jacobites, acknowledge but one Nature in *Jesus Christ*, one Will and one Operation, and say the Humanity was swallowed up in the Abyss of the Divinity, in such a manner that the Divinity and Flesh became but one and the same thing.

The Voyages  
of Pietro Della  
Valle. Tom.  
3. P. 107.

*IT* is in the same Sense that *Pietro Della Valle* comparing the Armenians with the Georgians, say's, That 'tis not to be doubted but the Georgians are better Christians then the Armenians, who hold the Errors of Dioscorus whose Opinions are far more Pernicious, gross and numerous, than those of all the other Christian Nations in the East.

Epist. 2. ad Wy.  
semb.

*IT* seems to me likewise that Person must be extreme obstinate that will not acquiesce in the Testimony of *Cyrillus* the Patriarch of *Alexandria*, (already mentioned) who lived in the midst of those people, who assures one of their Doctrines is, that all these humane Accidents, which the Gospel denotes in our Saviour Christ, as for Instance, to be born, to have conversed with men, to be dead, &c. did not happen to him really but only in appearance *κατὰ φαντασίαν*. How great aversion soever Mr. *Arnaud* may have to *Cyrillus* his Person, I do not believe he imagins, that this Patriarch had our Dispute in his mind, nor wrote upon my Account his Conference with the Armenian Doctor *Barsabas*; we may therefore gather from his Testimony, that the Armenians are perfect *Eutychiens*; for if they believed there was in our Saviour a real humane Nature, which is to say, that he was real man, and the whole Difficulty consisted only in the Term of Nature, which they would not receive, why should they affirm that his Conversation here on Earth, his Death and Resurrection were only in appearance? 'Tis evident they admit these false and deceitful Appearances, only because they deny the reality of the Substance, or Humane Nature.

Thom. a Jesu.  
de procuranda  
salute omni.  
Gent. Lib. 7.  
part. 1. C.  
17. Letters  
from forrein  
Countries to  
the Procur. of  
the Missions.

*HOW* willing soever *Thomas a Jesu* has been to mollify the extravagant Opinions of the Eastern Sects, yet he tells us of the Armenians, That they believe but one Nature, one Will and one Operation of our Lord *Jesus Christ*. And *Barbureau* the Jesuit, an Emiffary of Constantinople writing to one of the Society testifies the same thing. What shall I say, say's he, of the Armenians that are here (at Constantinople) to the Number of above sixty thousand in a more deplorable condition than the Greeks? For besides that they are as ignorant as them, they have a particular Heresie which distinguishes them from others; for they hold there is but one Nature in our Saviour Christ, and keep so firm to this Opinion, that 'tis a crime amongst them, so much as to mention the contrary. He do's not say 'tis a bare Equivocation in the Word Nature, as Mr. *Arand* would perswade us, but a Heresie, a false Opinion, and an Opinion of which they are so greatly conceited, that they hold the contradicting of it a Crime. But how can this be if they condemn *Eutyches* and *Dioscorus*,



*Dioscorus*, and affirm not the Humane Nature was confounded and swallowed up in the Divine: if they grant the Humane Nature as well as the Catholics, and their Error consists only in refusing to use the expression of the two Natures, as *Mr. Arnaud* assures us.

BUT after all these Testimonys I think I may re-establish the Authority of *Euthymius Zigabenus* the Greek Monk, and that of *Isaac* an Armenian Catholic, who have both of 'em Written against the *Schismatical Armenians*, and say the same thing as the rest. *Mr. Arnaud* says, they prevaricate and impose on their Readers, but what I now come from relating sufficiently justifies them from this Accusation. After the Council of Chalcedon, says *Euthymius*, the Armenians at the Instigation of one *Hilarinus Mandacanus*, and other Prophanè Priests that were with him, separated themselves from the Catholic Church: and having embraced the impious Opinion of *Eutyches*, *Dioscorus* and other Monophysical Hereticks that hold only one Nature in our Saviour Christ, they added thereunto several other impious Doctrines, to make their Heresie as it were more Compleat and Famous. For they say our Saviour Christ took on him a Body which was not of the same substance as ours, that his is Incorruptible, Impassible, Subtil, Uncreated, and Heavenly, which seemed to exercise the Humane functions, as to See, Eat, and Drink, and yet did none of all these things. They say moreover that the Flesh of Christ was changed into the Divinity, and made of the same Essence with the Divinity it self. That as a Drop of Honey or Vinegar cast into the Sea is not seen, do's no longer subsist; so the Body of Christ being ingulphed and swallowed up in the Ocean of the Divinity, keeps no longer its own Nature and propriety; and thus there are not two Natures in Christ, but one alone, which is wholly Divine. And therefore they deny the Sacrifice of Bread, which is the flesh of Christ, to be the Body of Christ, but call it the Body of the Divinity. That when they are convinced and constrained by strength of Argument, to acknowledge our Saviour Christ to be both God and Man, they do it by dissimulation, for how can they seriously acknowledge him to be Man, seeing as I already mentioned they affirm his substance to be different from ours. They change, says *Isaac*, the traditions of the Catholic Church, and the mysteries of Christ according to their blasphemous fancy; they do not call the Communion, or the Sacrifice of Bread which is the flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Body of Christ as he himself has called it, but the Divinity.

*Euthym. pan.  
tit. 20.*

*MR. Arnaud* may say as long as he pleases that these two Authors misrepresent the Armenians in charging them with believing the Humane Nature to have been ingulphed by the Divine, and to be pure *Eutychiens*. What reason has he to think the World will be satisfied with this answer, as if it were sufficient for the rejecting of Authors to bring against them bold accusations, without any ground or proof; and humorously maintain that what they affirm is false?

*Lit. 3. C. 8.  
P. 3. 415.*

*BREEREWOOD*, says he, and other modern Authors say as much. *Ibid. P. 456.* As to *Breerewood* tis true he says, that it seems by their confession touching the Trinity, sent by the Mandate of the Catholic of Armenia to the Patriarch of Armenia about fifty years since, that they have wholly renounced this Fancy. But this confession on which *Breerewood* grounds his supposal is at most only the private sentiment of this Catholic of Armenia, and not that of this Church. If *Breerewood* adds any thing of his own Head, without any Proof, his bare word is not to be preferred before the Testimony of other Authors, whom we have already alledged: that which we have

*inquiries.  
C. 24.*

seen of Cyril, and his dispute against *Barfabas* in the presence of all the People, and in the very Temple of *Jerusalem* is later than the confession he mentions. And so is that also which *Cottovic* relates. The Letter of *Barbereau* the Jesuit bears Date 1667. The Relation of the Bishop of *Heliopolis* which says (as we have already seen,) That the Patriarch of the Armenians to whom he gave a visit resided near the City of *Herivan*, in a famous Monastery of *Eutychie* Hereticks who are no less obstinate than ignorant, and being desirous to confer with one of these Monks on the principal Point of the Heresie of *Eutyches*, he cunningly shunned the occasion. This Relation I say is Dated 1668. All these Testimonys shew us, that the Armenians do still keep their Ancient error, and have in no wise changed their belief.

BUT supposing they were changed within these fifty or sixty years as *Breerewood* imagines, yet would what *Euthymius*, *Isaac*, and other Authors say be no less true, on the contrary the change which *Breerewood* attributes to them would only more Authorize their Testimony. For if it be true as *Breerewood* says, that they have now renounced that Fancy, they had it then heretofore, for People are not wont to renounce those Opinions which they never held: so that the Argument drawn from their Doctrine touching the unity of the Nature of *Jesus Christ* to shew they do not believe Transubstantiation do's still continue in full force as to the time past; and all that Mr. *Arnaud* can conclude hence, is, that it is possible for the Body of a Church to change an Opinion and pass over to another which is quite Opposite, without any noise or disturbance; whence it follows that the pretensions of the Author of the *Perpetuity* touching the impossibility of a change are vain and groundless. As to those other late Authors Mr. *Arnaud* speaks of, when he pleases to give us a particular Account of them we will examine 'em, but there's no Body but sees, after what I have related, that he ought not to speak so generally as he has done, That other Modern Authors are agreed therein, seeing, *Fohn Cottovic*, *Pietro Della Vallé*, *Cyrillus*, *Thomas a Jesu*, *Barbereau*, the Bishop of *Heliopolis*, are late Authors, and yet assert the contrary of what Mr. *Arnaud* affirms.

*Theorien.*  
Dial. advers.  
Arm. Bibl.  
Patr. Græc.  
lat. tom. 1.

NEITHER can Mr. *Arnaud* meliorate his cause by the Letter which was written by a Patriarch of *Armenia*, and sent to the Emperour *Emanuel*; nor by the conference which *Theorien* this Emperour's Deputy had with this Patriarch; altho it were true that this Letter has these Expressions, we hold there is but one Nature in *Jesus Christ*, not in confounding it, as *Eutyches* does; nor in denying *Christ's* humane Nature like *Apollinairus*, but according to *Cyrillus* Patriarch of *Alexandria* in the Books he wrote against *Nestorius*, insaying there was but one Nature of the Word which is Incarnate. But we must not immediately Imagine that this was the sentiment of the *Armenian* Church. It was the Patriarchs in particular, as appears by the Dialogue of *Theorien*. For after *Theorien* had for a long time disputed that, our Saviour had two Natures, two Wills, and two Operations; the Patriarch himself confessed this had been ever his Opinion since he read the sacred Writings. Whereupon *Theorien* having demanded of him why he inserted in his Letter to the Emperour, that there was but one only Nature in *Jesus Christ*; The Patriarch answered, that he had at that time in his thoughts the instance which is commonly made use of touching man who is made up of Body and Soul, and yet is said to have but one Nature, altho the two Natures of which he consists remain without confusion, and change; and that he believed *St. Cyril* meant the same. In fine he told him he would

would shew him a secret which had not yet been Divulged amongst his People? That there was a Patriarch of *Armenia* named *Fohn*, who was a bitter Enemy to the *Monophysits*; which is to say, to those that believe only one Nature in *Jesus Christ*; and that he had the writings of this *Fohn*, together with the approbation of another of his Predecessors named *Gregory*; who added thereunto these words, *I believe likewise what the holy Patriarch has here written, and Anathematise those that do not believe it.* It is evident by all these circumstances that the belief of the two Natures in *Jesus Christ* thus united to make thereof but one, was not the publick sentiment of the *Armenian Church*, but the private Opinion of the Patriarch, who disputed with *Theorien*, and that he had taken this Opinion from the secret writings of this *Fohn* and *Gregory*.

BUT it will be perhaps here demanded, how this person could in conscience continue a Patriarch in the *Armenian Church* being of a contrary judgment. To answer this Objection, I need only give the Character of this person, such as it appears to be in this same conference, and this will more confirm the truth of what I now said. *This, says he, do I intend to do, I will immediately write to all the Armenian Bishops whithersoever they be to assemble in Council. And when met, I will produce all the Arguments alledged by the Armenians, and which in effect do seem to favour them. Then will I propose on the other hand all the contrary proofs which you have now offered me, and at first will take the Armenians part, and dispute against you. But insensibly and by degrees, and with great caution, will begin to discover the Error of the Armenians, which has hitherto so greatly obtained amongst them. I will convince them by John the Patriarchs Book, and all the other Proofs you have furnished me with. In fine, I will declare myself openly for the Greeks (or to speak better) I will contend for the truth against the Armenians. I hope by Gods assistance my sheep will hear my voice and follow me, so that there will be but one Flock and one Shepherd. If all the Bishops shall be for me, nothing will be more welcome to me: But if not, I will notwithstanding confirm the true Doctrine together with those on my side; and send to the Emperour and your Patriarch a writing under my Hand and Seal and signed by my Bishops, containing the Orthodox Faith. Now this writing shall contain amongst other Articles this same, That we receive the Holy, and universal Council of Chalcedon, and all the Holy Fathers which that Council has receiv'd. That we Anathematise all those Anathematized by that Council; especially, Eutyches and Dioscorus, and Severus, and Timotheus Aylurus, and in general all those that have opposed this Council.* This Discourse plainly shews that this good Patriarch was a little *Jesuitical*, and did not make it a case of Conscience to Act a Deceitful part in his Council; much less in his Church. But 'tis likewise Easy to gather hence that the sentiment which he in the beginning proposed in his Letter to the Emperour, and which occasioned all this intrigue was not that of his Church, but his own particular, for had the difference between the *Armenians* and *Greeks* consisted only in the use of some terms as Mr. *Arnaud* tells us it did, there would have been no need of Stratagem to effect this design. It would have been sufficient to shew plainly that it was but an Equivocation, a mis-understanding, or at most but a question concerning words, which must not hinder the effects of Christian Charity. Neither was there any Necessity of promising the Emperours Deputy that there should be inserted in this new confession of Faith an express Article containing the Condemnation of *Eutyches*, and *Dioscorus*, if in effect the *Armenians* followed not their Opinions.



IT appears then from what I have said, that *Eutymius* and *Isaac* were neither Impostors, nor Calumniators when they attributed to the *Armenians* the Heresie of *Eutyches*; and said their belief was that our Saviour *Christ* had no real Humane Nature; but that his Humanity was swallowed up or changed into the Divine Nature. After the deposition of those Authors I mentioned, there can be no reason for the calling in question a thing so certain: now it hence manifestly follows that the *Armenians* cannot hold the Transubstantiation of the *Latins*, that is to say, the conversion of Bread into the substance of the Body of *Christ*, seeing they hold our Saviour has no longer a Body; and all Mr. *Arnauds* exceptions are vain and to no purpose.

### CHAP. III.

The Testimony of some Authors who expressly say or suppose that the Armenians hold not Transubstantiation.

**A**LTHO the Proof I already Alledged in the preceding Chapter decides the question, and needs not to be confirmed by others, yet will we here produce the Testimony of several Authors of good credit that unanimously assert the *Armenians* do not hold Transubstantiation nor the real presence.

Guido  
Carmel.

Summa de Heres.  
de Her. Arm.  
Cap. 12.

THE First is *Guy Carmus* who assures us of it in expresse terms, *The Twenty second Error*, says he, of the Armenians consists in their not believing that after the consecration is performed by the words of our Saviour *Christ* pronounced on the Bread, and Wine, the Body of *Jesus Christ* is truly, and really contained under the species of Bread and Wine, but they hold they are only so by resemblance and figure, saying that our Saviour *Christ* did not Transubstantiate the Bread and Wine into his real Body and Blood, but established them only as a resemblance and figure. And in another place Arguing against their Opinion, *The Armenians*, says he, have no Salvio for the truth of these words which they themselves utter in the Canon of their Mass, to wit, and that they may be made the real Body and Blood of *Jesus Christ*. They thus expound them, the true Body, that is to say, the true resemblance of the Body, but this exposition will not pass, because the true resemblance of the Body of *Jesus Christ* is not the true Body of *Jesus Christ*, as the Image of a Man is not a real Man. Man is the true Image and resemblance of God, but he is not true God by Nature; if then this be only the resemblance, and not the truth, or the true Body of *Christ* as the Armenians falsely say, it cannot be called the true Body. The Author of the *Perpetuity* and Mr. *Arnaud* reject this testimony, ask e'm why, they can give you no other reason but this, That they believe *Guy Carmes* was mistaken. 'Tis indeed my Opinion that we must not decide questions of this importance by the Testimony of some particular Persons who may deceive others or be deceiv'd themselves. But as to *Guy Carmes* what likelihood is there that a

Religious

Religious, who was all his life time devoted to the interests of the *Roman* Church, and often employed by the Pope upon several Occasions, as a most trusty Servant, and moreover a Person of good parts and considerable Learning in those Days, being Prior General also of his order, Inquisitor General of the faith, and Bishop of *Majorca* in the *Balearian* Isles, and wrote of the *Armenians* in a Book which he made concerning Heresies, what likelihood is there he should write a thing so positively and clearly that the *Armenians* deny the real presence, were he not well assured of it? What advantage could he expect by imputing falsely to a whole Church an Opinion which he himself held to be a Damnable Error, and that at the same time wherein the *Romans* that persecuted in the West those who were in this point of the same judgment, and why would he give this advantage against Truth to those deem'd Hereticks? It is moreover to be observ'd that *Guy Carmes* flourished under the Popedom of *Fohn 22*, that is to say, in an Age wherein all the East was overspread with Emissarys, and especially *Armenia* Raynald. ad ann. 13. 18. whose King *Offinius*, embraced the *Roman* Religion, receiv'd the Preachers which the Pope sent him for the Instruction of his People, and set up Schools throughout all parts of *Armenia* to teach the Religion and Language of the *Latins*. It was then no difficult matter for a Person in those circumstances wherein *Guy Carmes* was who undertook to give an account of divers Heresies to inform himself exactly what were the Opinions of the *Armenians*.

THE Author of the *Perpetuity* to get clear from this Testimony be- Perp. of the faith part. 3. Ch. 3. thought himself to say that *Guy Carmes* was the only Author that accused them of not agreeing with the *Roman* Church in the subject of *Transubstantiation*. *Despensus*, & *Alphonfus de Castro* say'd the same before him, and 'tis likely he grounded himself on their testimony. But so confident an assertion deserved well perhaps to be examined before it be taken up, and the Authority of two prejudic'd Persons ought not to be of so great weight with him but that he ought to have considered whether what they say be true. Mr. *Arnaud* has bin a little more circumspect than the Author of the *Perpetuity*. I will not dissemble, says he, that several Authors as well Catholics as Hereticks have accused the *Armenians* for not believing the real presence, *Guy Carmes* expressly imputes to them this Error. *Prateolus* says the same thing because he copys *Guy Carmes* his Words. We shall soon see that *Prateolus* is not the only Person that has followed *Guy Carmes*. It is sufficient to Remark here that Mr. *Arnaud* has believed the Author of the *Perpetuity's* Thesis was not justifiable, and therefore has chose rather of his own accord to forsake it than to be forced to it by a considerable number of Authoritys. I confess this acknowledgment of Mr. *Arnauds* is praise-worthy, but this confident Assertion of the Author of the *Perpetuity* is not so, for altho a retraction is a vertuous effect, yet methinks a man ought to be sparing in this particular. But to go on with our Proofs.

THE Second shall be taken from the Testimony of Pope *Fohn 22*. The Historian *Raynaldus* relates that in his time not only the *Armenians* which dwelt in *Cilicia* and *Armenia* embraced the Doctrines of the *Roman* Church, but those also that were driven out by the *Saracens* and were withdrawn into *Chersonesus Taurique* submitted themselves to the Bishop of *Capha* who was a *Latin*. That he received them in the name of the *Roman* Church. That the Pope thereupon congratulated them, and shewed them that in the Divine Mysteries the substance of Bread and Wine were changed into the Body and Blood of

of *Fesus Christ*, and that there ought to be mingled some *Water* with the *Wine* before it be consecrated. He afterwards produces this Popes Letter to the Arch-Bishop and *Armenian* Priests which were in the Diocess of *Capha*. *We have receiv'd*, says Pope John, great satisfaction in Understanding how the Almighty Creator displaying his virtue in you has enlightned your minds with the Knowledge of his saving Grace, and in that you have vowed to keep the Catholick faith which the Holy Roman Church truly holds, which she faithfully Teaches and Preaches, and that you have promised Obedience to the Roman Prelate and his Church, in the presence of our Reverend Brother Jerome Bishop of *Capha*. And therefore we earnestly desire that holding the saving Doctrines of this Church you likewise observe its Ceremonies, especially in what relates to the most excellent of the Sacraments, which is the ineffable Sacrament of the Altar. For altho all the other Sacraments confer sanctifying Grace, yet in this is contained intirely *Fesus Christ* Sacramentally under the species of Bread and Wine, which remain, the Bread being Transubstantiated into the Body of *Fesus Christ* and the Wine into his Blood. Then he tells them they must mingle water with the wine in the Chalice, because this mixture is a Commemoration of our Lords Death, and of the Blood and Water which gushed out from his side. 'Tis evident that this Pope applies himself only to these two Articles, because the *Armenians* held neither of them, and that in reference to them it was a new Doctrine and Ceremony in which they had need to be instructed. For to what purpose should Transubstantiation be recommended to them if they before held it for a fundamental point of their Ancient Religion? Why must all the other points of Controversy between the two Churches be laid aside, as that of the Proceßion of the Holy Spirit, the two Natures of our Saviour Christ, Purgatory, Confirmation, and several others to stick wholly to Transubstantiation, and the mixture of Water? The thing declares it self.

MR. *Arnaud* who is of all men in the World the most ready at proofs, makes one of this. The Pope, says he, so little distrusts the *Armenians* believed not Transubstantiation, that altho he proposes it to them expressly, yet he does it only occasionally, and by way of principle, to assert the Wine ought to be mixt with Water. And this last particular is that to which he particularly applies himself, and which is the Capital or Summary of his Letter; whereas had he had the least thought that the *Armenians* believed not Transubstantiation, he would without doubt have set about proving it, and that with more care and earnestness than he does the mixture of Water in the Chalice.

MR. *Arnaud* must pardon me if I tell him, 'tis not true that the Pope does only occasionally mention Transubstantiation and by way of principle to establish the mixture of Water. *Raynaldus* who relates this affair gives a better account of it than he, *ipso instruxit*, says he, *ut in divinis mysteriis substantia panis et vini integris speciebus, cum Christi corpore et sanguine commutaretur, et vino consecrando aqua modica affundenda esset*. I believe I do not do ill in opposing against Mr. *Arnaud*'s Illusion, a truth attested by an Historian that faithfully relates the matter, without the least regard to our dispute. Moreover what can be more unreasonable than to say as Mr. *Arnaud* do's that the Pope proposes Transubstantiation only occasionally and by way of Principle to establish thereby the putting of Water into the Cup? What Relation is there between these two things, it do's not follow from the believing of Transubstantiation that Water must be put in the Chalice, nor that those which do not do it oppose this Doctrine. These are two distinct points which



which have their Proofs apart without any Coherence or mutual dependence, and there cannot be perhaps any thing imputed to a Pope less be-  
 seeming the Dignity and Infallibility of the Head of the Church than to  
 make him argue after this manner. *The Bread and Wine are Transubstantiated, therefore you must put Water into the Chalice.* Mr. Arnaud ought  
 to be more careful of the Honour of this Prelate, and observe that  
*Transubstantiation* and the mixture of Water are not in his Discourse a kind  
 of Principle and Conclusion, (this would be Ridiculous) but a Doctrine, and  
 Practice which the Pope recommends to the *Armenians*, to the end they may  
 be henceforward conformable to the *Roman Church* in the subject of the  
 Sacrament of the Altar, and thus *Raynaldus* understood it, who has been  
 more sincere in this than Mr. Arnaud. As to that minute observation that the  
 Pope do's more insist on the mixture of Water than on *Transubstantiation* it is  
 not worth considering for this proceeds not from the cause Mr. Arnaud imag-  
 ins, but only from the Popes declaring to the *Armenians* the mystical signifi-  
 cations of this mixture, which required some Discourse, and which *Raynaldus*  
 has well observed, who distinguishes these three particulars in the Popes Letter,  
*Transubstantiation, the Mixture of Water, and the mystical significations. Ipsos*  
*instruxit ut in divinis mysteriis substantia panis & vini integris speciebus, cum*  
*Christi corpore & sanguine commutaretur, & vino consecrando aqua modica affun-*  
*denda esset, ac divina eare adumbrata mysteria aperuit,* that is to say, he taught  
 'em the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, the mixture of *Water*, and shewed  
 them the mysteries represented by this mixture.

MY third Proof is taken from the information which *Benedict XII*  
 Successor to *Felix* the XXII caused to be made touching the Errours of  
 the *Armenians*, not at *Rome* (as Mr. Arnaud has asserted through a mistake,  
 of which inadvertency were I guilty how severe would he be upon me?) but  
 at *Avignon*, where he kept his seat, and whence his Bull is dated. The 67. Ar-  
 ticle is exprest in these Terms, *The Armenians do not say that after the words*  
*of Consecration, the Bread and Wine are Transubstantiated into the Body and*  
*Blood of Jesus Christ Born of the Virgin who suffered and rose again. But they*  
*hold that this Sacrament is a representation, a resemblance or a figure of the true*  
*Body and Blood of our Lord. And this some of the Armenian Doctors have*  
*particularly asserted, to wit, that the real Body and Blood of Jesus Christ are not*  
*in the Eucharist, but that it is a representation, and a resemblance of them. They*  
*say likewise that when our Saviour instituted this Sacrament, he did not Tran-*  
*substantiate the Bread and Wine into his Body, but only instituted a representa-*  
*tion or a resemblance of his Body and Blood, and therefore they do not call the*  
*Sacrament of the Altar, the Body and Blood of our Lord, but the Host, the Sa-*  
*crifice, or the Communion. One of their Doctors called Darces has written that*  
*when the Priest says these words, this is my Body, then the Body of Jesus Christ*  
*is Dead, but when he adds, by which Holy Spirit, &c. then the Body of Jesus*  
*Christ is alive; yet has he not expressed whether it be the true Body or the resem-*  
*blance of it. The Armenians likewise say we must expound that which is say'd*  
*in the Canon of their Mass, by which Holy Spirit the Bread is made the real*  
*Body of Jesus Christ in this sence, that by the real Body of Jesus Christ, we*  
*must understand the real resemblance or representation of the Body and Blood of*  
*Jesus Christ. And therefore Damascen censuring them for this says that the*  
*Armenians have this Two Hundred years abolished all the Sacraments, and that*  
*their Sacraments were not given them by the Apostles, nor Greek or Latin*  
*Church, but that they had taken them up according to their own Fancy.*

*Raynaldus.*  
*ad Ann.*  
*1341.*

MR Arnaud who in looking over his *Raynaldus* has met with this clear Testimo-  
 ny

C. 9. 348.  
E. 485.

ny yet ~~it~~ has not been perplexed with it, for his invention never fails of finding out ways to shift the force of the most plain and positive truths, and to turn them to his own advantage. He tells us that after an exact search into the cause which might move *Guy Carmes* to impute this Error to the *Armenians* he at length found it in this information which Pope *Benedict* the XII ordered to be drawn up. He adds, *that if this Original has been known to the Ministers, yet they have found greater advantage in standing by the Testimony of Guy Carmes then in ascending up to this Source.*

BUT all this Discourse is but a meer Amusement. For when Mr. *Arnaud's* conjecture should be right, it would not thence follow *Guy Carmes* his Testimony were void, and the Ministers had no right to alledge him, nor that the Information aforementioned do's impute to the *Armenians* those Doctrines which they have not. There is great likelihood that *Guy Carmes* made not this information his rule, for besides that he say's nothing of it, he reckons up but Thirty Errours of the *Armenians*, whereas the information computes 'em to be about One Hundred and Seventeen. But supposing it were so, all that can be concluded thence is, that in the Fourteenth Century the truth of the things contained in this act was not questioned, but past for such certainties that the Writers of those times scrupled not to make them the Subject of their Books. And this is all the use which can be made of Mr. *Arnaud's* Remark.

BUT howsoever, what can be said against an act so Authentick as that of *Benedict's*, which was not grounded on uncertain Reports, but on the Testimonies of several Persons worthy of credit, *Armenians* or *Latins* who had been in *Armenia*, and whom the Pope would hear himself that he might be ascertain'd of the Truth?

Raynald.  
Ibid.

TO know of what weight or Authority this piece is, we need but read what the Pope wrote on this Subject, to the Catholick or Patriarch of *Armenia*. *We have long since*, says he, *been informed by several Persons of good credit, that in both the Armenia's there are held several detestable and abominable Errors, and that they are maintained contrary to the Catholick Faith which the Holy Roman Church holds and teaches, which is the Mother and Mistress of all the Faithful. And altho at first we were unwilling to credit these reports, yet were at length forced to yield to the certain Testimony of Persons who tell us they perfectly understand the state of those Countries. Yet before we gave full credit, we thought our selves Obligated to make exact search of the Truth by way of judiciary and solemn information, both by bearing several witnesses who likewise told us they knew the state of these Countrys, and taking in Writing these their Depositions, and by means of Books which we are informed the Armenians do commonly use wherein are plainly taught these Errors. He says the same in his Letter to the King of Armenia, and in his information 'tis expressly said, that the Pope caused these Witnesses to appear personally before him, and gave them an Oath to speak the truth of what they knew concerning the Doctrines of the Armenians, that these Witnesses were not only Latins that had been in Armenia, but Armenians themselves, and that the Books produced were written in the Armenian tongue, and some of those were such as were in use in both the Armenia's? I think here are as many formalities as can be desired, and all these circumstances will not suffer a man to call in question the truth of those matters of fact which are contained in this act.*

Raynald.  
Ibid.

YET

YET will not Mr. *Arnaud* agree herein. He says, *that in this monstrous heap of Errors there are several senseless, extravagant and Socinian Opinions.* Li. 5. C. 2.  
P. 434. *That therein Original Sin, the Immortality of the Soul, the Vision of God, the Existence of Hell, and almost all the points of Religion are denied. That therein are also contrary Errors, so that 'tis plain this is not the Religion of a People, or Nation, but rather a Rapsody of Opinions of several Sects and Nations.* I confess there are in these Articles several absurd Opinions, and some that differ little from Socinianism, but this hinders not but they may be the Opinions of a particular People. The Pope expressly distinguishes in his Bull three sorts of Errors contained in his information, some that are held in both one and the other *Armenia*, others which are held only in one *Armenia*, and the third which are only held and taught by some particular Persons. And this distinction is exactly observed in the Articles themselves, in which the Particular Opinions are Described in these terms, *quidam*, or *aliqui tenent*, as in Article CVI. *Quidam Catholicorum Armenorum dixit & scripsit, quod in generali Resurrectione omnes homines consurgant cum Corporibus suis, sed tamen in Corporibus eorum non erit Sexuum discretio.* And in the CVIII Article, *Aliqui magni Homines Armeni Laici dixerunt quod sicut bestia in morte expirant, & sic moriuntur, ita & Homines; & sicut bestia cum semel morte fuerunt, nunquam resurgent, ita nec homines.* The Opinions held only in one *Armenia* are likewise denoted exactly in these Words. In majori *Armenia*, In minori *Armenia*, or, *Catholicorum majoris Armeniæ, Catholicorum minoris Armeniæ.* The common Opinions are expressed in these Terms, *Armeni dicunt, Armeni tenent.* And altho in the Article which respects the real Presence and Transubstantiation we find these words. *Et hoc specialiter aliqui magistri Armenorum dixerunt, videlicet quod non erat ibi Corpus Christi verum & Sanguis, sed exemplar, & similitudo ejus;* yet is this same sentiment imputed generally to all the *Armenians*, for the Article begins thus, *Item quod Armeni, non dicunt quod post verba consecrationis Panis & Vini sit facta Transubstantiatio Panis & Vini in verum Corpus Christi & Sanguinem.* And towards the end of the same Article there is, *Quod etiam Armeni illud quod ponitur in eorum Canone Missæ, per quem panis Benedictus efficitur verum Corpus Christi, exponunt quia efficitur ibi vera similitudo, & exemplar Corporis & Sanguinis Christi. Unde Damascenus propter hoc reprehendens eos dixit, quod ducenti tunc anni erant quod Armeni perdidissent omnia Sacramenta, &c.* It is then clear that this information attributes this Opinion not to some particular Persons, but to the whole Body of the *Armenians*, seeing that on one hand this Article bears the Character of Errors, common to the *Armenians*; and on the other there is applied to 'em what *Damascene* say'd of 'um so long before, *that they had lost all the Sacraments.* Let Mr. *Arnaud* bestir himself as fiercely as he pleases, he cannot hinder us from perceiving that if this Article related only to Particular Persons; witnesses of the Fourteenth Century, that depose what it contains would never have sought in the eight Century, that is to say, Six Hundred Years before the Authority of *Damascene* to confirm what they deposed, and even to confirm it by a passage which respects the Church of the *Armenians* in general, and which accuses it for having no true Sacrament.

MR. *Arnaud* observes afterwards that in this same Article there is accused another *Armenian* Doctor named *Narces*, for saying when the Priest pronounces these Words, *Hoc est Corpus meum*, the Body of Jesus Christ is then in a state of Death, and when he adds, *per quem*, the Body of Jesus Christ is then alive. *It is true*, says he, *the information adds that this Doctor does not express whether he speaks of the true Body of Jesus Christ, or of the Figure.* C. 2. P. 436.



*But the difference of these two states of Life and Death being to be found in a figure which does not change, sufficiently shews that he spake of the true Body of Jesus Christ. If these two states of Life and Death cannot be found in a figure, much less in the true Body of Jesus Christ, which is no more Subject to Death, nor the Necessity of rising again. Is Mr. Arnaud so greatly prejudic'd that he cannot perceive the sense of this Doctor is, that the Eucharist is a mystery which expresses the whole œconomy of Jesus Christ, especially his Death, and Resurrection, according to the common Doctrine of the Greeks, from which in this respect the Greeks do not vary?*

Ibid.

IN the Seventyeth Error, says he moreover, *the same Armenians are charged with believing that when any one receives the Eucharist, the Body of Jesus Christ Descends into his Body, and is converted therein as other aliments, which is a contrary Heresie to that of Berengarius. But as Berengarius would not have scrupled to call the Bread, which is the Sacrament of the Body of Jesus Christ, the Body of Jesus Christ; so neither would he have scrupled to express himself in the same manner, as this Article makes the Armenians do, That the Body of Jesus Christ, that is to say, the Bread which is the figure of it, Descends into our Bodies, and is changed into our Bodies. So that this contrariety which Mr. Arnaud imagins, has no Ground. But there is a real Opposition between this Discourse of the Armenians that the Body of Jesus Christ is Changed into our Bodies as other food, and the Opinion of Transubstantiation; for how can it be conceived that the proper substance of the Body of Jesus Christ which is in Heaven should be changed into our Bodies, that an incorruptible substance should be digested, and changed, that a substance which exists after the manner of Spirits, should nourish us and become food to us? It appears then from this very thing that by the Body of Jesus Christ the Armenians mean only the Sacrament or Mystery of this Body, which in respect of its substance is real Bread.*

Ibid.

NEITHER is it to any purpose to Remark, as Mr. Arnaud do's, that those to whom was attributed the believing the Eucharist to be only the figure of Christs Body were not wont to call the Eucharist the Body of Jesus Christ, and yet commonly the Armenians do thus call it, as appears by their Liturgies. For 'tis evident the sense of this Article is, not that absolutely the Armenians rejected this expression, seeing it immediately afterwards attributes it to them; but that it was not usual amongst them, especially since they saw the Latins abused it, and therefore they chose rather to use those of Host, Sacrifice and Communion.

Ibid.

IT is also to no purpose to say the Liturgy of the Armenians is contrary to this Opinion, seeing it contained the Bread is made the real Body of Jesus Christ; for they expounded it in this sense, that the Bread is made the true resemblance, or the representation of the Body of Jesus Christ. *This explication, says Mr. Arnaud, is so absurd and ridiculous, that it could not be very common, it being impossible the generality should entertain it. But does Mr. Arnaud believe that Transubstantiation being fully and truly explained, as it is in it self, and consequences and dependencies, can be more easily entertain'd by a People than this sense which the Armenians give to the terms of their Liturgy?*

Ibid.

AS to what he adds, *that it is say'd, in the Seventyeth Article, that*  
according

according to the Armenians the Eucharist do's not effect the remission of Sins, nor confer Grace, and that this is contrary to the Words of the Liturgy of the Armenians of Leopolis, and a passage of the Catholick of Armenia in the conference of Theorien, which say's they Sacrifice in the Church the son of God for the Salvation of the whole World. All that Mr. Arnaud can conclude hence is, That the Armenians residing in Armenia do not well agree in this point with those of Leopolis in Poland, and that the Catholick which conferred with Theorien was of no great consideration amongst them; but it cannot hence follow that the things which these Articles contain are only the Opinions of some particular Persons.

BUT, says moreover Mr. Arnaud, the Armenians justified themselves by acts, decrees, and formal declarations; the King of Armenia, caused a Religious named Daniel to draw up a Memorial, in which he protested against these Errors, and complains they were unjustly charged on his Nation. The Patriarch and Bishops being assembled condemned them. The Patriarch of the lesser Armenia declared to Clement the Sixth his faith touching the Eucharist in these terms; That the Body of Jesus Christ born of the Virgin Dead on the Cross, and which is now alive in Heaven after the Words of the Consecration of the Bread which are, *This is my Body*, is in the Sacrament of the Altar under the species and appearances of Bread.

THERE is a strange Illusion in all this Discourse. 'Tis true the King of Armenia who needed the Popes protection drew up this Memorial mentioned by Mr. Arnaud. But seeing he had this Remark from Raynaldus he ought not to have suppressed what the same Raynaldus adds, *Ceterum non falso subornata erant hac crimina in Armenos, nec temerè credita à Benedicto, Raynald. ubi falso senim Clementi VI. Armenia Regis Oratores plures errores in Armenia pullulasse, & Clementem studia sua ut abolerentur applicuisse visurum sumus.* Moreover the Armenians were not falsely accused of these crimes, nor did Benedict believe them without sufficient grounds. For the Ambassadors of the King of Armenia confessed to Clement the Sixth, that several Errors had sprung up in Armenia, and Clement used his utmost endeavours to crush them, as we shall see by what follows. This dis-acknowledgment then of the King, and complaint which Daniel made concerning the imputation of Doctrines to the Armenians which they never own'd, was only a Politick intrigue, which yet does not hinder the information of Benedict from being true. I do not doubt but the King in the extremity of his affairs, threatned by the Saracens, and having no hope but in the protection of the Latins, assembled his Bishops that they might satisfy the Pope in what he desired, and condemn the Errors contained in his Bull. But if Mr. Arnaud will conclude, that then they had them not before, Raynaldus will draw a contrary Consequence, that then they had them. For after having say'd, as I now recited, that these Errors were not falsely charged upon the Armenians, he immediately adds as a reason which confirms his Proposition. *Quin etiam commoti pontificiis monitis Armeni præsules coacta solemnī Synodo numeratos superius Errores Ecclesiastica execratione damnaverunt, ac decreta insigni ad sedem Apostolicam legatione imperiis se pontificiis adhaesuros professi sunt.* But moreover the Armenians moved by the Popes remonstrances called a Synod, wherein they Condemned with an Anathema the Errors contained in this information, and sent Ambassadors to the Pope to make profession of their Obedience to his Commands. He proves that the Errors contained in the Popes information were really the Armenians, because the Bishops met together to Condemn them. What a great

great deal of difference there is between a Person that is prejudiced and one that is not. *Raynaldus* is naturally no more favourable to us than *Mr. Arnaud*, the one is a Priest of the Oratory, and the other a Doctor of the *Sorbonne*, yet they draw from the same matter of fact contrary Conclusions; one hence shews the *Armenians* were innocent of the things they were accused, and th'other from the same Principle proves they were Culpable. And this because one has the dispute in his Eye, and th'other not, the one Reasons without passion and th'other is in a heat.

AS to what *Mr. Arnaud* say's touching the Patriarch of the lesser *Armenia* who so Authentickly declared his faith concerning the *Eucharist* to *Pope Clement VI.* I cannot but desire the Readers attention to this subject, for here he will perceive one of *Mr. Arnaud's* notorious Sophisms. It is to be observed then that after *Benedict* the XII. had sent into *Armenia* the Catalogue of this Peoples Errors, the affairs of the *Armenians* growing every day worse, they resolved (that they might render the *Latins* favourable to 'em) to make in a Synod a pretended Decree wherein they feigned to renounce these Errors, and abjure them; which made *Pope Clement VI.* (who was *Benedict's* Successor) to send them *Anthony* Bishop of *Gayette*, and *Fohn* Arch-Bishop of *Pisa*, in quality of Apostolical Legats to finish (if Possible) the Work of their reduction. *Raynaldus* speaks of this act as of a Piece, not by which they cleared themselves of a false accusation, but whereby they renounced their Opinions, *Post habitam*, says he, *Synodum atque in ea repudiatos Errores.* And *Clement* speaks after the same manner in the Letter he sent them. *Vestra Synodo prout per vos commode fieri potuit convocata, Errores abieciatis et condemnastis predictos, sicut in libello quem nobis transmissistis continetur.* Observe these terms *repudiatos Errores*, & *Errores abieciatis*, for they expressly signifie a change of Opinion, a renunciation of their former Errors, and not a bare Condemnation of Errors for which they had been in reference to their Church in General impertinently accused, as *Mr. Arnaud* would make us believe. But the King of *Armenia* urged the Pope to assist him against the Soldan of *Babylon*, who fell upon his Kingdom; and the Pope pressed him on the other hand, to assist his Legats in the extirpating of those Errors which were so rife in *Armenia*. He wrote also to the Legats to inform him of their Success, who gave him to understand they lost their Labour, and that whatsoever declarations the *Armenians* had made, they still persevered in their Opinions. Which appears by a Letter of *Clement* to the Bishop of *Nicosia*, *ab eorum Erroribus*, say's he, *idem Rex, Catholicus, et Populus minime resipuisse dicuntur, sicut per quasdam litteras missas & Scripturam exhibitam nobis luculenter apparet.* They persevered therein, they repented not of them, say's the Pope, and *Mr. Arnaud* would needs perswade us they were falsely accused.

THE Pope had charged his Legat with some opposite Articles to the Errors of the *Armenians* to make 'um receive them, and that which respected the *Eucharist* contain'd these words, *That the same Numerical Body of Jesus Christ, idem numero, which was born of the Virgin and nayled to the Cross is contain'd in the Eucharist.* One of the Legats, *Anthony* by name, dyed in the way, and *Fohn* having performed his Voyage fail'd not to propose these Articles to the *Catholick of Armenia Minor* and his Bishops. But the *Catholick* refused to approve them, he absolutely rejected some of them, and made captious and doubtful answers to others; he never would admit of the Article touching the *Eucharist* which contained, *That after*  
*Consecration*

*Raynald. ad*  
*ann. 1346.*  
*Num. 67. 68.*  
*&c.*

*Raynald. ad*  
*ann. 1310.*  
*Num. 37.*

*Raynaldus ad*  
*ann. 1351.*  
*Num. 32.*



*Consecration it was the same Numerical Body of Jesus Christ which was born of a Virgin and suffered on the Cross. He wrote a Letter in which of fifty three Articles which were offered him he rejected sixteen of them, amongst which was that of the Eucharist; and in the Answers he made to the Pope's instructions, he would never admit of Transubstantiation, but barely says, he believed and held that the Body of Jesus Christ born of the Virgin, dead on the Cross, and which is now alive in Heaven, after the words of the Consecration of the Bread which are, this is my Body, is in the Sacrament of the Altar under the species, and resemblance of Bread, sub specie & similitudine panis. Now 'tis on this whereon Mr. Arnaud grounds himself concealing all the rest of this History and producing only these last words, and drawing from them his Conclusion after his usual Manner in these terms, I see no reason to doubt of the faith of this Patriarch considering this his declaration, that is to say, it plainly appeared hence that he believed Transubstantiation, and the Substantial presence of the Body of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist.*

Lib 5: C. 9.  
pag. 488.

BUT Mr. Arnaud is too quick at drawing of Consequences. For I. he ought not to have dissembled that in all this affair the question is not whether the Armenians held, or did not hold the things contain'd in the information of Benedict, but whether they sincerely renounced them; and whether the act of their renunciation sent to the Pope was feigned or real. II. He ought not to have dissembled likewise that the whole conduct of the Armenians was in this respect but a mere cheat, invented only to remedy the disorders of their State, and procure assistance from the Western Princes. That the Pope laid hold on this Occasion to make them receive the Roman Religion, and they on their side endeavoured to deceive the Pope and draw from him what they desired, in eluding his pursuits. Which is justified by the Letter sent by Clement himself to the Catholick of Armenia. Moreover, says he, we have bin several times informed by divers Persons worthy of credit, and even by Armenians, that you and your Predecessors the Catholicks of Armenia, and the Armenians under your jurisdiction do not in any manner observe, what you promised us and our Predecessors the Roman Prelates touching the Faith. And that which is yet worse and more deplorable, is, that you have contemned and utterly rejected the wholesome Instructions of our Apostolical Legats sent you in regard to your Souls, but have after a Damnable manner despised the Faith of the Roman Church, out of which there is neither Grace nor Salvation. The same thing appears by Clement's Letter to the King of Armenia, in which having exhorted him earnestly to endeavour to make his Patriarch receive the Roman Doctrine sincerely and purely without duplicity of heart, to the end his Clergy and People may be reunited to the Latin Church, he adds, that by this means the mouths of several Catholicks and Armenians too will be stop't who stick not to affirm, That the Patriarch and other Armenians proceeded not in this affair with faithfulness and simplicity, but with dissimulation; and that which is yet worse and more deplorable, they affirm the Armenians have turn'd into derision and contempt the saving Doctrine which the Legats of the Holy See have communicated to them.

Raynaldus  
ibid. Numb. 17.

Raynald. ibid.  
Numb. 18.

III. HE ought not to have conceal'd that the Patriarch of Armenia, who would save himself by ambiguous Answers, rejected the Article of the Eucharist which contain'd, that it was the same Numerical Body which was Born of the Virgin and crucified; and that he neither would admit of the Article of Transubstantiation, because both one and the other so manifestly contradicted his faith, and left no room for his Equivocations.

Raynald. ibid.  
Numb. 19.

In

Raynaldus  
ibid. Numb. 2.

ibid. Numb.  
11.

ibid. Num. 15.

In fine, he ought not to have concluded so briskly as he has done from the terms of his Answer, that after this Declaration, there could be no Reason to doubt whether this Patriarch had the same faith as the Church of Rome. For notwithstanding this declaration Clement VI. still doubted of it, as also the Cardinals, Patriarchs, Arch-Bishops, Bishops, and Doctors with whom the Pope consulted about it. Observe here the Contents of Clement's Letter to this Catholick of Armenia. *We have kindly receiv'd your answers, and those of the Church of Armenia minor, reduced to certain heads; and having deliberately considered them, together with my Reverend Brethren the Cardinals of the Roman Church, some Patriarchs, Arch-Bishops, Bishops, and other Prelates, we could not, nor cannot now gather from these answers, till such time as you give us a more clear Discovery, what you and the Church of Armenia minor do truly and sincerely hold and believe.* He afterwards adds this obliged him to make interrogations on Each Article, and desired plain and direct answers. In effect he proposes 'em to him, and coming to the Article of the Eucharist having set down the first answer of the Patriarch in the terms I already recited, he adds, *upon this we demand first of all whether you believe the Bread is Transubstantiated into the Body of Jesus Christ.* Then coming to speak of a certain Letter which the Patriarch wrote wherein he rejected sixteen Articles, of the fifty three which were offered him, and amongst the sixteen this. *Quod Corpus Christi post verba Consecrationis sit idem numero, quod Corpus natum de virgine & immolatum in cruce,* he says to him, the terms of your Letter wherein you write that you have taken away sixteen Articles of the fifty three which were given you by our Arch-Bishop and Bishops are confused and obscure, as also the particular answers you returned by Writing. Therefore we desire to know of you plainly, and truly, whether you have rejected these sixteen Articles because you do not believe 'em to be true and sound, or for what other reason you have retrenched them from the rest. But Mr. Arnaud being better inform'd than this Pope with his Cardinals, Prelates and Doctors, and better instructed in the intentions of the Armenian Patriarch than all the People then in the World, comes and confidently tells us, that he sees no reason to doubt of the faith of this Patriarch, and thinks Mr. Claude himself will acknowledge as much. And suppressing all these matters of fact related by the very Historian he makes use of, he proclaims his Victories; and confidently affirms, the Armenians have ever believed the real Presence and Transubstantiation.

Raynaldus  
ibid. Numb.  
18.

BUT Raynaldus is of a contrary Opinion, for having related the whole story of what passed between Clement the VI. and the Armenian Patriarch which was only the Sequel of Benedict's information, he adds, *That we may thence plainly see into how many filthy Errors thy fall who separate from the Church of Rome. That innovators howsoever have no reason to glory in the Antiquity of their Heresies, nor bragg, (for the seducing of the weak) that the Armenians and other Eastern People have the same sentiments with them. For altho they hold some of these Errors, yet do they not admit them all, but differ from the Armenians in very considerable matters. That the Divine justice is rather to be admired which has permitted the Armenians infected with these Errors to fall under the power of the Barbarians.* This is not a proper place to Answer Raynaldus in, 'tis sufficient he acknowledges the Armenians did in effect hold, all these Doctrines which are attributed to them in the act of Benedict, in the instructions of Clement, and consequently that they deny'd Transubstantiation and the real Presence.

WE

WE may then reckon as a IV Proof, the testimony of *Raynaldus* together with that of Pope *Clement's*, and the Catholick of *Armenia's*. The 5<sup>th</sup>. shall be taken from Pope *Eugenius IV.* who in the instructions he gave to the *Armenians*, in the Council of *Florence*, forgot not the Article of *Transubstantiation*, the form, says he, of this Sacrament consists in our Saviours words by which he compleated this Sacrament. The Priest speaking in the Person of our Saviour Christ do's the same. For by the virtue of these words the substance of Bread is changed into his Body, and the substance of Wine into his Blood, so that Jesus Christ is intirely contain'd under the species of Bread, and Wine, and is intire under each part whether of the Consecrated Host or Consecrated Wine, even when the species are separate. Mr. *Arnaud* say's, 'tis not usual to propose Capital Points of Controversie in this manner. That they are not tackt to the Tail of other Articles, nor are so lightly passed over, but considered established and strengthened. But Mr. *Arnaud* forgets how the Pope established and strengthened the addition of the *Filioque* to the Symbol; which he injoynd them to receive, altho a controverted Point. How did he confirm the Article of the two Natures in *Jesus Christ* but by giving them the definition of the Council of *Chalcedon* and the Letter of Pope *Leo*? Upon what Reasons did he ground the Article of the Remission of Original sin in Baptism when the *Armenians* were guilty in this Point of a Capital Error, as appears by the information of *Benedict XII*? What Proofs did he bring to shew 'em that the Consecration of the Eucharist is made by the words of our Saviour, when the *Armenians* believ'd the contrary, as we may see in the same information? These kind of Remarks which are usual with Mr. *Arnaud* have neither light nor Solidity in them. *Eugenius* is excusable let Mr. *Arnaud* say what he will; he thought it no wise necessary, to insert common Places in his Decretal, nor to be so scrupulous in observing Heads or Tails, like such as view the *Dragon* in the Firmament. He design'd only to give the *Armenians* the form of Doctrine which they ought henceforward to hold in reference to the Points wherein he believed they erred according to the report of the Bishop of *Pamiez* in the Passage I have related. Now the Article of *Transubstantiation* being expressly mention'd therein, 'tis a sign the *Armenians* did not believe it.

*Eugen. ad  
Calcedon  
Concil.  
Florent.*



## C H A P. IV.

*Testimony of several other Authors that affirm the Armenians deny Transubstantiation, and the real Presence.*

**T**HE Sixth Proof which I bring to confirm the Truth of the Proposition I defend, is taken out of Authors of the *Roman Communion*, who have bin so far from questioning *Guy Carmes's* Testimony, that they have on the contrary followed and confirmed it by their suffrages. We may reckon in this number *Thomas Waldensis* a famous Author of the fifteenth Century, and a zealous Defender of *Transubstantiation*, who writing against *Wicliff*, calls the *Armenians*, *Nepotes Berengarii*, *Berengarius his Children or Disciples*. I mention 'em, says he, to the end we may have a care of 'em. And therefore also *Guy Carmes* speaking of them, says, that the Twenty Second of their Errors is, that after the Consecration, the Body of Jesus Christ is not really under the species of Bread, and Wine, but only in Representation and Figure. That Jesus Christ did not really Transubstantiate the Bread and Wine into his Body and Blood, but only in Resemblance and Figure.

*Thom. Vald.  
Tom. 2. Cap. 30.*

*Prateolus  
Elench. haret.  
pag. 63. in  
Armen. art.  
12.*

**PRATEOLUS** a Dr. of Divinity that lived about an Hundred years since, testifies the same thing, *They deny*, says he, (speaking of the *Armenians*) *the true Body of Jesus Christ to be contain'd really in the Sacrament of the Eucharist under the Species of Bread and Wine.*

*Bzovius ad. an.  
1318. Num. 16.*

**BZOVIVS** an Historian of our time and a continuer of *Baronius*, has not scrupled to follow *Prateolus* in this Point. He observes as well as he for the Twelv'th of their Heresies, *That the true Body of Jesus Christ is not under the species of Bread and Wine in the Eucharist.*

*Coccius. Thef.  
Cathol. tom.  
3. pag. 601.*

**IODOCUS Coccius** a Cannon of *Fuliers*, in that confused heap of Collections he has made of passages out of the Fathers touching controverted Points, follows *Guy Carmes*; and relying on his Testimony assures us, *That the Armenians deny the Eucharist to be the real Body and Blood of Christ, affirming it to be only a sign thereof.*

*Thomas à  
Jesu. Lib. 7.  
part. 1. C. 17.*

**THOMAS à Jesu** who has made strict inquiry into the Opinions of the Schismatical Eastern Churches, has thought (as well as others) he ought not to deviate from the sentiment of *Guy Carmes*, nor that any man has Reason to doubt of the Truth of his Testimony. He relates and approves it, and says, *That the Armenians deny the true Body of Jesus Christ, to be really contained in the Sacrament of the Eucharist under the species of Bread and Wine.*

*Dr. Avily  
Tom. 1. of  
Ancient and  
Modern  
Heresies  
p. 349.*

**DR. Avily** in his computation of Heresies both Modern and Ancient, has likewise follow'd *Guy Carmes*, and assured us from his Testimony  
*That*

*That the Armenians teach Christ's Body is not really under the Bread, nor his Blood under the Wine.*

HOW comes it that these Authors who appear otherwise so zealous for the Interests of the *Roman Church* have not found out this pretended mistake of *Guy Carmes*? Why should they suffer themselves to be so grossly imposed on? or, to speak better, whence has *Mr. Arnaud* this extraordinary Revelation? how comes he to be better informed than other People?

WE shall in the following Chapter search into the Grounds of his Opinion, and the Proofs he brings, only mentioning here several Protestants, whose Testimony is the less to be suspected, inasmuch as, what they wrote was not all design'd for our controversy. We have already seen in the Discourse about the *Moscovites*, that *Lascius* a *Polander* writing of the *Armenians* of *Leopolis* say's, they believe the Bread and Wine retain their first Nature. They deny, say's he, that in the Sacrament of the Eucharist the Elements lose their Nature. They administer the Sacrament with Wheaten Bread dipt in the Cup. They mingle no water with the Wine. They shew a greater respect to the Sacrament than the *Russians*, believing our Saviour Christ is therein such as he was Born of the Virgin, and after the Incarnation there was such a Conjunction, and affinity, between the Divine and Humane Nature, that they were not separated in the Sufferings of Jesus Christ nor ever can be. They have this Opinion from *St. Chrysostom* that Jesus Christ suffers something more in the Eucharist than he suffered on the Cross, because in the Eucharist he suffers the Sacramental fraction. And when I demanded of them how this could be, seeing the Nature of Bread and Wine remains without being changed after the Consecration, they answered me, This was effected by the Divine virtue, to which we ought to give credit. And these are *Lascius* his words, according to the Original, but different from *Mr. Arnaud's* Version. It now concerns us to inquire into the advantage or prejudice which hence accrue to the cause I defend, for if on one hand I pretend to prove by what has bin abovesaid that the *Armenians* believe not Transubstantiation; *Mr. Arnaud* undertakes to prove by it also that they believe the real Presence. But as to my pretention I think 'tis well grounded and beyond all Question, seeing this Author say's expressly they deny the Elements lose their Nature.

*Joann Lascius  
civis de Rel.  
Armenia*

HE has had his informations, say's *Mr. Arnaud*, only from some Ignorant Persons in *Leopolis*. If this be a sufficient ground for rejecting the Testimony of *Lascius* in reference to Transubstantiation; why do's *Mr. Arnaud* cite the same Testimony to shew the *Armenians* believe the real Presence? Has this Author met with ignorant persons for the informing him in one Point, and knowing ones for the other? perhaps, say's he, he did not comprehend that by the word Nature, they meant only the Mass of external Accidents. But he ought to assert things more likely to be probable. Where will he find the *Armenians* ever took the term Nature, for the Mass of external accidents separate from their substance? The existence of accidents without a subject is one of those Difficulties of which (he himself tells us in another place) the *Greeks*, the *Armenians* and *Copticks* of our times make no mention. Why then would he have 'em to use in a familiar Discourse the word Nature to signify a thing which is unknown to 'em, or of which at least they make no mention? *Mr. Arnaud* makes and marris these Principles

*Lib. 5. C. 4.  
P. 449.*

*Ibid.*

*Lib. 10. C. 8.*

according as his occasions require, *Diruit, edificat, mutat quadrata rotundis*. Which shews his Answers are mere Evasions, and in effect there's no Body that reads these words of *Lascius*, but will immediately comprehend they mean the *Armenians* deny *Transubstantiation*. Now this is precisely the Point in question between the Author of the *Perpetuity* and me. Hitherto our Disputes has not concern'd the real Presence.

BUT seeing he is desirous to treat of it, I must tell him there is a great deal of difference between his pretension and mine, that mine is grounded on clear expressions which are not capable of any other sense; whereas on the contrary his are established on obscure and Ambiguous Terms, of which he has not comprehended the sense. For these Persons say only *That our Saviour Christ is in the Eucharist such as he was born of the Virgin Mary*. Now we have already seen that according to them, *Mary* only brought forth the Divine Nature, which had only a Body in appearance, *κατασχευ* and not really. Upon this Hypothesis their sense will be, that the Divinity being every where, it must of Consequence be in the Eucharist. And with this agrees what they add, *that after the Incarnation, there was such a conjunction and society between the Divine and Humane Natures, that they were not separate even in the Sufferings of Christ*. For by this Conjunction they understood not a Union which leaves the two Natures distinct, for in so saying they would not contradict the Orthodox sense, but they meant a Confusion of the Humane Nature with the Divine, a swallowing up of this Humane Nature into the Abyss of the Divinity, as we have already seen they commonly held. So that all the real Presence which they Understand in the Sacrament, is no other than the presence of the Divinity, which is every where, but more especially in the Eucharist. 'Tis very probable 'twas under this Equivocation the Patriarch of *Armenia* Minor sheltered himself in the answer he made to the Articles of Pope *Clement VI.* which we have related in the preceeding Chapter. *The Body of Jesus Christ, say's he, Born of the Virgin, dead on the Cross, and which is now alive in Heaven, is in the Sacrament of the Altar under the species and representation of Bread.* The Body Born of the Virgin and Dead on the Cross, which was to say, according to them, the Divinity, which in being Born of the Virgin had the appearance of a Body and Dyed in appearance on the Cross. But when he was urged to acknowledge 'twas the same *Numerical Body*, he would not grant it, because he believed the term Number reduc'd the Body of *Christ* into the same Rank with other Humane Bodies, and consequently made it a real Body. Mr. *Arnaud* will reply, this is one of my Conjectures which has no surer foundation than his *may be so's*. But he has no other Grounds for his *may be's* than his own Imagination, whereas I lay my Conjectures on the very Hypothesis of the *Armenians*, having first solidly shewn 'tis such as I describe it.

Breerewood's  
Inquiries  
Ch. 24.

WE may add to the Testimony of *Lascius* that of *Breerewood*, in his Treatise of Religions. For he say's expressly, *That the Armenians deny the true Body of Jesus Christ to be really in the Sacrament of the Eucharist under the species of Bread and Wine.* I confess indeed he grounds himself on the Authority of *Guy Cumes*, but this shews he takes it for an unquestionable truth.

MR. *Alexander Ross* in his view of Religions likewise tells us, *that the Armenians*



Armenians do not hold the Body of Christ is really present under the form of Bread and Wine.

View of Religions Printed at Amsterdam Gallice 1666.

MR. De Vicqfort a Gentleman whose name is almost known thro out all Europe, for his skill in Languages and other exquisit qualifications, has obliged the publick with a Translation into French of *Herbert's Voyages*, in which are found these words, *The Armenians administer the Sacrament of our Lords Supper under the two Species of Bread and Wine, and deny the real presence of the Body of Christ, acknowledging only the two Sacraments of Baptism and the Lords Supper.* There has hapned upon the Account of this Translation a very Remarkable circumstance. You must know then that Mr. *Arnaud* in the first edition of his Book having made an Objection to himself concerning this Passage of *Herbert*, and heightened it as much as he could to the saying, *he marvelled Mr. Claude never offered it, being so considerable as to startle most People, that he thought there could be nothing replied to such an expresse passage, and that this Author seemed to speak no more than what he had learnt from the Armenians themselves.* Having I say propos'd this Objection, he Answers, *that this was a Remarkable forgery of the Calvinistical Translator. That having desired some of his Friends to Translate from the Original English, whatsoever related to the Armenians in that Book, he found by their Translation that not only he does in no wise speak of the real Presence, but that almost all the discourses contained in the 249<sup>th</sup>. and 250<sup>th</sup>. page were foisted in by the Translator, who made his Dreams and Fancies pass for the Relations of a Traveller. That 'tis likely he has done the same in several other places, so that this whole Book is rather the Translators Romance than the true account of a Voyage.* This Discourse being very disingenuous and reflecting on the reputation of a worthy Gentleman, who has ever manifested in his Writings and Conversation an exemplary sincerity, it has happened that Mr. *Vicqfort* having seen this charge in Mr. *Arnaud's* Book has publickly justified himself from it. And for this effect has produced before Mr. *Pompone* the French Kings Embassadour into Holland Mr. *Arnaud's* Nephew, *Herbert's* Book in English Printed at London. 1638. by Rich. Bishop, wherein is precisely these words, *They administer the Lords Supper in both kinds, Bread and Wine, and deny a real Presence. They allow but our two Sacraments.* Having produced this Original, he caus'd a Letter to be Printed and directed to me, in which he complains of the injustice Mr. *Arnaud* has done him, and protests, *he is not of that Temper to make use of Frauds to uphold the Truth of that Religion he professes, as knowing it abhors them, and makes no difference between the cheats which the Modern Divinity of some call pious, and the falsehood that destroys the Soul of him that utters it.* He then recites Mr. *Arnaud's* Expressions, and refutes his Calumnies, and offers for his justification the very words contained in *Herbert* in the manner I related 'um. Afterwards he says he does not believe Mr. *Arnaud* dares now justify, *that in the Original English there is no mention of the real Presence, nor affirm 'tis a mere imposture of the Calvinistical Translator. That he also affirms whatsoever is to be met with in page 249 and 250, concerning the Baptism of the Armenians, their Proselytes, Fasts, Images, Priests, their Belief touching Purgatory, their Superstitions, and Efforts which the Jesuits have made to subject them to the See of Rome, is really contained in the Original English, there being nothing of his Invention in all this. And to justifye it relates at length Herbert's own words in that Language.*

*Herbert's Voyages* Lib. 2. p. 244

Lib. 5. C. 8. p. 481. First Edition.

THIS so well grounded defence, has obliged Mr. *Arnaud* to retract in the Second Edition of his Book this accusation Printed in the First. He has retrenched all those Injurious Discourses against the Reputation, and sincerity of Mr. *Vicqfort*, and acknowledged his Translation to be faithful and exactly according to the Original. He has at the same time discovered to us the cause of his mistake, to wit, that there having bin two Editions of *Herbert's* Book one in 1634, th'other in 1635. in which the Author contained himself within the Relation of his Voyage; and the Second in 1638, wherein he had added several particulars relating to Religion and History, those whom he consulted had seen only the first Edition, but that Mr. *Vicqfort* Translated from the Second in which was found the Passage in question.

I am far from being of that Humour to insult over Mr. *Arnaud* in this Occasion, nor draw advantage from his precipitous way of falling foul on Authors, who mean not the least hurt to him. I do not doubt but he is troubled at his own rashness in grounding a charge of this importance on a supposition, he has found to be false, without considering whether there might not be more Editions of *Herbert* than one. But he must suffer me to tell him that what he has inserted in his Marginal Notes is not a sufficient excuse for him, *the French Translation*, says he, *making no mention of two different Editions of this English Book, we could not Divine it.* Much less could the Translator Divine he would be accus'd for an Impostour, for not having declared there were two Editions of this Book. These kind of Accusations pronounced with such confidence do suppose a Man to have made an exact Inquiry before he utters them, whereas had Mr. *Arnaud* taken the least pains in this respect he might have easily discovered there was a Second Edition of *Herbert's* Book, and found what he has bin since shewed. He needed not divine but certainly inform himself, for this Book being Printed at *London* in 1638, and being moreover famous in that kind, he might have been soon satisfied concerning it. But supposing he could not, he ought not presently to call a Person a Deceiver: But rather to have proposed his doubts, and require a solution of Mr. *Vicqfort* himself, and not thus rashly charge a Gentleman that never offended him. I could willingly forbear mentioning this particular, Mr. *Vicqfort* having no need of my Apology, did not the interest of my cause oblige me to declare to the World how little confidence we ought to have in Mr. *Arnaud's* Discourses, if they be not upheld by solid and convincing Proofs, which they never are, as appears from this whole dispute.

Lib. 5. c. 8.  
2. Edition.

BUT laying aside this contest see we what Mr. *Arnaud* offers against the Authority of *Herbert*, who expressly affirms the *Armenians* deny the real Presence. *We matter not*, says he, *the advantage which the Calvinists would make of this Testimony of Herbert, who to enlarge the Second Edition of his Book, has added what he pleased, touching the Religion of those People through whose Countrys he travelled, without telling us from whom he learnt what he Relates of them, for he only says what he has taken out of Authors of his own Sect, who have treated of them, as Breerewood has done. Those Authentick Proofs which we have produced touching the faith of the Armenians do fully solve this Point. And not to mention others, there is no comparison between a Calvinist who speaks in his own cause, and according to his interests, without Authority and proofs, and a Lutheran, such a*  
one

C. 8. 2.  
Edition,

one as Mr. Olearius is, who speaks against himself and his own interest, and cites the Persons from whom he learnt what he tells us.

MR. Arnaud has soon forgotten what he wrote on this same subject in his first Edition, *We may well admire, say's he, that Mr. Claude, who is wont to propose slight Objections, should omit one, which is very considerable in appearance, and enough to startle People, because the solution of it is so hard to be found, that we cannot justly reproach him, if he be ignorant of it. The Objection is, that we meet with this passage in a Translation of Herbert's Voyages, That the Armenians deny the real presence of the Body of Christ. It seems there can be nothing replied to so clear a passage, and that this Author who tells us what he learnt from the Inhabitants themselves of those Countrys, as well as Mr. Olearius, may at least weaken his Authority.* Chap. 8.  
first Edition.

WHENCE I pray comes this so manifest a contrariety of judgment? As long as the pretended Imposture of the Translator continues in Mr. Arnaud's thoughts, Herbert's Authority is weighty and sufficient to startle People, the solution of it is difficult, and it seems there can be nothing replied to so plain a passage. But so soon as this pretended Imposture vanishes, then 'tis, we matter not the Testimony of Herbert, and judicious Persons ought not to credit it. Before he was an Author who speaks what he learnt from the Inhabitants themselves thro whose Countrys he passed. Now he is a Person that to enlarge his Book has in his Second Edition added what he pleases. Before he was an Author, who may well weaken the Authority of Mr. Olearius, now he is a Calvinist in no wise comparable with a Lutheran, such as Mr. Olearius. What is this but a sporting with Authors, extolling 'um, depressing them, and making 'um good or bad according as Mr. Arnaud's Occasions require. 'Tis plain he wants an object to exercise his wrath on; if it be not the Translator, it must then be the Author; and when the living escapes him, then the Dead must pay for't. Who told Mr. Arnaud that what Mr. Herbert relates in his Second Edition is not what he Learnt from the Inhabitants themselves thro whose Countrys he travelled, but Excerptions from Breerewood? He dared not mention, say's he, from whom he learnt what he relates. If this be sufficient to invalidate the Testimony of Travellers, we can be certain in nothing they tell us touching the manners of People, and their Religions; for it seldom happens that Travellers denote the Persons from whom they have bin inform'd, and if they be unfaithful in respect of the things they tell us, they may be as well so in reference to the naming of Persons.

MR. Herbert was a Person of Quality, deservedly Honourable both for his Learning and Integrity. He has viewed whatsoever was worth his Observation both in *Asia* and *Africa*, and carefully denoted the manners and Religions of People, writing nothing till such time as he was well informed of the Truth of it. What means Mr. Arnaud then thus to attack his Memory, and tells us that a Person thus qualified has copied out from Breerewood, that is to say, from a Scholar who perhaps never travelled farther than his own Country?



## CHAP. V.

*Mr. Arnaud's Proofs touching the Armenians examin'd.*

*Lib. 3. C. 6.  
p. 457.*

**B**UT here are, say's Mr. Arnaud, certain and positive Proofs which shew that the Armenians have ever effectually believed both one and the other Point, and that there is no reason to accuse them of denying the real Presence or Transubstantiation. Which we shall now Examine in this Chapter.

*Ibid.*

HIS first Proof is taken from the Testimony of *Lanfranc*, who disputing against *Berengarius* say's, that the Greeks and Armenians, and generally all Christians hold the same faith as the Roman Church. But Mr. Arnaud has not considered that *Lanfranc* do's not directly impute Transubstantiation either to the Armenians, or Greeks, he imputes it to 'um only by a Consequence drawn from their glorying all of 'um that they receive in the Sacrament, the real Body and real Blood of Jesus Christ taken from the Virgin. Now we have seen as well by the Relation of *Carmes*, as from the Information of *Benedict*, that the Armenians gave this expression a sense wholly contrary to *Lanfranc's* Consequence, so that this Proof has bin already invalidated by the Testimony of the Armenians themselves.

THE Second is taken from the *Berengarians* never alledging they were of the sentiment of the Armenians, or any other Eastern Church. Yet was it impossible but they must know what was their Opinion, seeing that Persons Voyaged from all parts of Europe into the East, and this would have bin a specious pretence to the *Henricians* and *Albigenses* to avoid the rigour of those punishments they underwent. But to discover the weakness of this reasoning we need only remember that in the 14 Century under *John XXII. Benedict XII. and Clement VI.* it was held in the West for an undoubted truth that the Armenians denied Transubstantiation, and the real Presence, as we have already seen in the foregoing Chapter. That 'twas the unanimous Report of the Armenians themselves who were in the Court of Rome, and of the Latins which had bin in Armenia. Yet altho the Disciples of *Berengarius* were rigorously persecuted in that age, we do not find they ever justified themselves by the example of the Armenians, nor that the Court of Rome handled them less severely upon the account of this conformity. We find on the contrary, their adversaries have reproached them with following the Heresie of these Eastern People, as appears by what I have already related concerning the disputes of *Thomas Waldensis* against *Wicliff*, so that that was objected against them as a Crime which Mr. Arnaud would have them make use of for an Apology.

*Ibid. p. 459.*

THE III. and IV. Proof are no more conclusive than the two first. They contain that *Gregory VII* marking in particular the Errors which the

the *Armenians* ought to condemn to the end they might be received into the Communion of the Church, makes no mention of any Error against the real Presence and *Transubstantiation*. That in the year 1145. The Patriarch and Bishops of *Armenia* sent Embassadors to Pope *Eugenius* II. to render him all kind of Submission, and make him judge of the differences which they had with the *Greeks*. That if this Pope had believed they were in the Error of *Berengarius*, he would not have bin contented to instruct them in the Ceremonies of the Church and manner of Celebrating the Sacrifice. That *Othon* of *Frisinga* who relate this History would never have concealed so important a circumstance. I answer that *Gregory* VII. particularizes only four Errors, for which he Censures the *Armenians*. I. That they mix no water with their Wine in the Chalice. II. That they compound the Chream with Butter, and not with Balm. III. That they reverence *Dioscorus* as a Saint, altho he was condemned. In fine, that they added the (sign) of the Cross to the *Triasagios* after the manner of Hereticks. How many other Doctrines and Customs have the *Armenians* besides these four Articles, which the *Roman* Church do's not approve of? They hold the Opinions of *Eutyches*. They do not hold the Doctrine of the Propagation of Original sin. They deny *Purgatory*. They still offer Sacrifices after the manner of the *Jews*. They condemn third Marriages, for as bad as Fornication. They deny the Sacrament of Confirmation. They do not hold the Consecration of the Bread is made by the only words of *Jesus Christ*. They believe the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father alone, and several other Points which sepearate 'um from the *Latins*; and of which neither *Gregory* VII. *Eugenius* III. nor *Othon* of *Trifinga* make any mention. Which shews there can be drawn no Conclusion from their silence, and that Mr. *Arnaud* may better employ his time than in collecting these kind of Proofs.

*Bavon ad  
con. 114.*

THE V. is taken from some expressions of a Catholick of *Armenia*, *ibid. p. 460*, who say's, in the conference of *Theorien*, that the Wine becomes by Consecration the Blood of *Jesus Christ*, and that the Son of God is Sacrificed within the Church for the Salvation of the World. But this Proof is too weak to confirm what Mr. *Arnaud* pretends. For first we have already shewed him that this Catholick spake of his own head, and not from his Church. And moreover, what he say's do's neither conclude the real Presence, nor *Transubstantiation*. The Wine becomes by its Consecration the Blood of *Jesus Christ* in representation and mystery, according to the exposition which the *Armenians* themselves give to these ways of speaking, as we have seen in the foregoing Chapter, and the Son of God is Sacrificed in the Church in Commemoration, inasmuch as the action of the Eucharist is a Mystery which represents his death. Let Mr. *Arnaud* consult (if he pleases) the Marginal Note which is on the side of this last passage, and he will find the solution of his Difficulty. The Greek Text has *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου παντὸς σωτηρίας*, the Latin, *Mactatur intus Dei filius pro totius mundi salute*, and the Marginal Note, *hoc est, representatur in sacra cena mactatio Christi*.

*Theorien Dial.  
adver. Armen.*

THE VI. Proof is taken from that during the Croisado's the Popes held a lasting and strict Union with the Church of *Armenia*. That the Catholick of *Armenia*, yielded obedience to Pope *Eugenius* III. That this Union was confirmed under *Innocent* III. who sent a Crown to *Leó* King of *Armenia*, and that as well this King, as *Gregory* the Patriarch

*Ibid. pag. 462.*

of *Armenia*, sent an Ambassador to *Innocent* to acknowledge the Primacy of the *Roman Church*. That there were Alliances made between the *Latin Princes* and those of *Armenia*. That Pope *Innocent* excommunicated the King of *Armenia* at the request of the *Templars*, and some time after gave him Absolution. That this Union lasted during *Gregory IX.* his time, and *Clement VI.*

BUT what is this but a telling of Stories, and copying out of *Raynadam* at any rate. If the proof which Mr. *Arnaud* pretends to draw from this Union be sufficient to conclude the *Armenians* were conformable to the Church of *Rome* in the Doctrines of the real Presence and Transubstantiation, 'twill be sufficient to conclude likewise that they were conformable to herin all the other Points concerning which we do not find the Popes ever troubled themselves to correct them, or make the least inquiries about them. They were satisfied in the Kings and Patriarchs of *Armenia's* acknowledging their Authority, hoping by this means to introduce hereafter quietly amongst them the Religion and Ceremonies of the *Latins*, and in the mean time made use of 'em in other occasions. The Kings of *Armenia* on the other hand were very ready to give the Popes encouragement to believe they would reduce their Kingdoms to the obedience of the *Roman See*, and in the mean time procured the assistance and protection of the *Latins*, whose power was then Formidable throughout the whole East. But this did not hinder the *Armenians* from keeping still their Doctrines and Customs, as appears by what we have seen in the preceeding Chapter of *John XXII.* *Benedict XII.* and *Clement VI.* The 79 Article of the information of *Benedict* expressly mentions, That the Priests and Bishops of *Armenia* enjoyed a penance during some years to those that had bin Baptized by the *Latins*, and condemned them to undergo a 5 years penance who had received from them the other Sacrament. And the 86 Article. That the *Armenians* say, and hold, that since the Council of *Chalcedon*, the *Roman Prelate* has no more Authority over them which are under him then the Patriarch of the *Nestorians* over the *Nestorians*, or the *Greek Patriarch* over the *Greeks*, that the Pope knows his own power and the *Armenians* likewise theirs. And the 99<sup>th</sup> Article; that the *Armenians* persecute those amongst them who have been Baptized according to the form of the *Latins*, and hold the Faith of the *Roman Church*, and that they say the *Roman Church* Errs, and that they *Armenians* keep the true and Catholick Faith. And the 117<sup>th</sup> Article. That the *Armenians* keep not the true Faith which the *Roman Church* holds, nor its Sacraments, and Blasphemes against the *Roman Church* the Pope and his Cardinals, saying they are Hereticks. That the *Catholick* of *Armenia* minor say'd, the Pope and Cardinals destroyed more Men every day than they had Hairs on their heads. And altho they preach against *Simony*, yet do they grant no favour without committing it; that as to them *Armenians* they had all of 'um kept themselves undefiled in *Armenia* minor, except the King and some Persons of Quality who held the *Roman Faith*. 'Tis then to no purpose for Mr. *Arnaud* to tell us that *Innocent III.* and the other Popes would not have held so strict a Union with the *Armenian Church* had they believed the *Armenians* were *Berengarians*, seeing they did at the same time stir up all *France* against the *Albigenses*, and caused 'um to be exterminated with Fire and Sword. These excellent Reasons do not hinder, but that the *Armenians* held still all their Opinions contrary to the Doctrines of the *Roman Church* under the Popedom of *Benedict XII.* And II. that amongst those Opinions, that which denies Transubstantiation and



and the real Presence is plainly remarked. III. That altho the Kings and some Persons of Quality embraced the *Roman* Religion, yet the Body of the *Armenian* Church kept to their Ancient Religion, even to the blaspheming the *Roman* Church, the Pope, and his Cardinals, according to the Terms of the Article which I now mention'd. IV. In fine it will not be found, that *Innocent* III. or any other Pope required of the *Armenians* any particular Renunciation of their Errors, be they what they will. It seems either these Popes supposed the *Armenians* had absolutely the same Faith as the *Roman* Church, or dissembled these Errors, in hopes, as I already say'd, that in establishing their Authority in *Armenia*, they might introduce amongst them the Religion of the *Latins*, by means of their Emissaries which the Kings favoured, and to whom some Bishops gave liberty to preach, as appears by the 78 Article of the Information of *Benedict*. The *Catholick of Armenia minor*, say's this Article, *Consecrating Six Bishops has drawn from them a Publick Act, in which they solemnly promise, to suffer no longer their Youth to learn the Latin Tongue, and to give no more liberty to the Latin Preachers, who Preach the Faith of the Holy Roman Church in their Diocess, or Province. Moreover he obliges every Bishop he Consecrates, to Anathematise the Armenians that desire to become true Catholicks, and obey the Roman Church. He forbids them to Preach that the Pope of Rome is the Head of the Eastern Church, and calls himself Pope, acting in this quality in the Eastern Countrys from the Sea to Tartaria.*

AS to what Mr. *Arnaud* tells us concerning *James de Vitry*, and *Brocard's* silence who impute not to the *Armenians* the denying of *Transubstantiation*, we may answer him that their silence ought not to come in competition with the Testimony of so many Authors, who expressly affirm they deny it. Moreover *Brocard* speaks not of their Opinions, and *James de Vitry* takes notice only of the Ceremonies and Rites which appertain to the external part of their Religion, without mentioning any thing of their Doctrines. But Mr. *Arnaud* who comes and offers us a Demonstrative Proof of the Union of the *Armenians* with the Popes in the time of the *Croisado's*, ought not to conceal what *James de Vitry* has written on this Subject; altho the *Armenians*, say's he, *promised obedience to the Sovereign Prelate and Roman Church, when their King receiv'd the Kingdom from the Emperor Henry, and the Regal Crown from the hands of the Arch-Bishop of Mayence, yet would they not part with any of their Ancient Ceremonies or Customs.* And these were their Reunions with the *Roman Church*. Ibid. p. 464.  
456.  
Jacob a  
Vitruco  
bistor. Orient.  
cap. 79.

'TIS true there was in those Times one of their Kings named *Hayton*, who marvelloussly favoured the *Latins*, and perhaps 'twas he of whom Mr. *Arnaud* speaks, who took on him at last the Habit of *St. Francis*. But be it as it will, this King did all he could to introduce the *Roman* Religion into *Armenia*, but in vain. Observe here the words of the Information of *Benedict* Art. 116. *A King of Armenia called Hayton assembled all the Doctours and Bishops of his Kingdom together with the Patriarch to unite 'em to the Roman Church, and dispute with the Legat which the Roman Church had sent; But the dispute being ended the King acknowledged the Truth was on the Romanists side, and that the Armenians were in an Error, and therefore ever since, the Kings of Armenia minor have embrac'd the faith of the Roman Church. Yet were not the Bishops Doctours and Princes satisfied with this,*

after the departure of the Legat a Doctor named Vartan wrote a Book against the Pope and his Legat, and against the Roman Church, in which he calls the Pope a Proud Pharaoh who with all his Subjects are drowned in the Sea of Heresy. He says that Pharaoh's Embassadour, meaning the Legat, returned home with shame. &c. 'Tis to be observed that this Book of Dr. Vartan's altho full of passionate Invectives against the Pope and his Church, yet was receiv'd in Armenia, as if it had bin the Canons of the Apostles.

WHICH considered, I see no reason to prize so much these feign'd Submissions which the Kings of Armenia have sometimes yielded to the Pope by their Embassadors, as for instance such as was that of King *Osinus* paid to *Fohn XXII.* by a Bishop who in the name of the King, and his Kingdom, made such a profession of faith as they desired. To make this a proof, as Mr. *Arnaud* do's, is either to be ignorant, or dissemble the Genius of this Nation. The *Armenians* in the exigency of their affairs, made no scruple to send to the Pope Persons, that promised him whatsoever he desired; but as soon as ever the danger was over, and they had obtain'd of the *Latins* what they desired, they made a mock at their promises, as *Clement VI.* reproaches them in his Letters to the King, and Catholick of Armenia, as we have already observed in the preceding Chapter.

The Ambassage of Dr. *Garcias de Sylva Figueroa* Translated by Mr. de Vicqfort. p. 193.

WHICH has bin well observed by the Author of the Book called the Ambassage of Dr. *Garcias de Sylva Figueroa*. The Religion, say's he, of the Inhabitants of the new Zulpha, who are Armenians by birth, is the Christian, together with the Opinions which the Pope suffers them to retain. But to speak the truth there are very few that reverence, or acknowledge the Pope; almost all of 'um obstinately retaining their own ancient Religion. For altho several of the Bishops and Priests of their Nation that have passed over into Europe, (moved thereunto by their extream poverty, their expences in travelling, and intollerable persecutions of the Turks, during the continual Wars between them and the Persians,) have often offered to obey the Roman Church, yet when this was to be concluded, they have still fallen off, and refused to acknowledge any other Authority than that of their Patriarch, obstinately retaining their ancient Ceremonies and Liturgys. This has bin the perpetual complaint of the *Latins*. But Mr. *Arnaud* has imagined this a secret to us.

THERE is perhaps more heed to be given to what he alledges touching a certain Person named *Gerlac*, who belonged to the Ambassador sent from the Emperour to Constantinople, about an hundred years since. This *Gerlac* relates in one of his Letters a Discourse he had in matters of Religion with the Patriarch of the Armenians at Constantinople, and amongst other things he tells us, They hold that the real Body of Jesus Christ is present in the Sacrament in its proper Substance (He means the same as they of the *Ausbourg* Confession) *In cena Domini verum & Substantiale Corpus & Sanguinem Christi adesse dicunt, sed videntur Transubstantiationem probare.* But upon the reading of this Letter, it will soon appear that, this Patriarch with whom he discoursed, gave him his own private sentiments, and not the Doctrines of the Armenian Religion. For he tells him, that he believed and confessed that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son, contrary to what the Greeks hold. Yet do's it appear from the constant

Testimony

testimony of Authors, who treated of the Opinions of the *Armenians*, that they hold the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father alone, and are in this particular at accord with the *Greeks* against the *Latins*. So say's *Guy Carmes*, the information of *Benedict XII. Prateolus, Breerewood* and several others, and therefore the first thing *Eugenius IV.* did in the Council of *Florence*, when he gave his instructions to the *Armenians*, was to oblige them to receive the Symbol with the addition of the *Filioque*. Besides this *Gerlac's* Patriarch expressly declares he holds the Doctrine of the Ubiquity, that is to say, of the presence of the Humane Nature in *Jesus Christ*, wheresoever the Divinity is, which is not the real belief of the *Armenians*, as we have already sufficiently proved. *Gerlac* adds, *That they acknowledge the Roman Prelate to be the Head of the Universal Church*, which is not true, as appears as well by the information of *Benedict*, as by the Testimony of several other Authors. 'Tis moreover apparent that his affirming them to believe the Substantial Presence of the Body of *Jesus Christ* in the Sacrament is only grounded on this pretended Doctrine of the Ubiquity, which grants this Body to be every where, and by Consequence in the Sacrament. And as to *Transubstantiation*; he do's not absolutely impute it to 'em, but say's they seem to admit of it, *videtur*, say's he, *Transubstantiationem probare*. Let the reader judge whether this Translation be faithful. *It appears*, is an expression which gives the idea of a thing clear and evident, whereas every one knows that the *videtur* of the *Latins* which Answers our *English* word *It seems*, gives the Idea of a thing which has the likelihood and colour, but which is not absolutely out of doubt, of a thing which we may think to be true, but of which we have no certainty. 'Tis likely *Gerlac* grounded his *videtur* on the General Term *to change*, which the *Armenian* Patriarch made use of, but in effect this Term do's not signify a *Transubstantiation*, and 'twas only *Gerlac's* prejudice which perswaded him it did.

THE same prejudice may be observed in *Mr. Olearius* as appears from his own words, *I was informed*, say's he, *by the Patriarch of Armenia who visited us at Schamachia a City of Media, that the Armenians, held Transubstantiation. Now believing Transubstantiation, that is to say, the change of Bread and Wine into the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, 'tis not to be questioned but they hold the true and real Presence.* His Authority in reference to the *Armenians* is only grounded on a *that is to say*, as it was in respect of the *Moscovites*. If you deny his explanation, his Testimony signifies nothing.

AS to the attestations which *Mr. Arnaud* produces of *Hacasiour* the Patriarch of the *Armenians* reunited to the *Roman Church*, and who is now at *Rome* where *Mr. Arnaud* tells us he has taken care to have him consulted, and of *Uscanus Vardapet* an *Armenian* Bishop who was not long since at *Amsterdam*, we know very well there's little heed to be given to these sort of Peoples testimony; who never come into the Western parts but upon the Account of some Temporal interest; and never fail to Answer as you would have them. The *Latins* and the Popes themselves have bin often deceiv'd, and if I may not be believed, let *Anthony de Gouveau* an Emisary of the Mission of *Hispaham* be consulted, who in the History he wrote concerning the reduction of the *Armenians* of *Persia* tells us, *that altho in the Union made in the Council of Florence,*



Anthony  
de Gourcay's  
Relation,  
Book 3. Ch. 3.

the Armenians reunited themselves, and the greatest part of the Greek Church likewise, yet these People proceeded not with that fervour and diligence which was requisite in a matter of that importance; on the contrary they were so little mindfull of it, thro the malice or negligence of their Prelats, that I do not find amongst them the least sign of this reduction, nor anything which this Council decreed, nor Obedience thereunto recommended. There is no mention of it in their Books and Traditions. And I wonder that John Laurens of Anania in his Universal Fabrick should say, that the Armenians almost in General have lately received the determinations of the Trent Council, seeing not so much as the name of it was scarce ever heard by the Bishops or Patriarch, nor have they altered any of their Customs either good or bad, for this many Ages. But perhaps this Author was informed of this by some Armenians passing throughout Europe, or that dwell therein upon the account of Trade, who for the most part return answers according to the desires of those that ask 'um, and that they may not fail therein, do very often speak contrary to truth, which the Bishops and Prelates of these Schismatics who come to Rome often do to gratifie the Pope, promising their Flocks shall yield Obedience to him, but at their return home, they soon forget their engagements. Let any one then judge of what weight the attestations of these People are, and whether the Discourses of Hacciadour and Vardapet, are to be preferred before so many other convincing Testimonies which assert the contrary of what they affirm.

## CH A P. VI.

Of the Nestorians, Maronites, Jacobites, Copticks, and  
Æthiopians. That they hold not Transubstantiation.

Lib. 5. C. 10.  
p. 491.

**W**EE shall treat in this Chapter of the other Eastern Sects that profess the Christian Religion. Mr. Arnaud pretends they all of 'um hold the real Presence and Transubstantiation.

AS to the Nestorians he grounds his Opinion concerning them on the silence of Ancient and Modern Authors, who never told us the Nestorians differ from the Church of Rome in this particular. He adds that the Emissaries sent by the Pope into these countrys to endeavour their reduction to the Obedience of the Roman See, never discovered any thing to make 'um suspect the Faith of the Nestorians touching the Eucharist. He say's in fine, that when the Nestorians reunited themselves to the Church of Rome, they were never required to make any particular declaration of their belief in reference to the Eucharist.

BUT as to what respects the silence of Authors, we have already answer'd in the case of the Moscovits, that they do only chiefly observe those

those points which are expressly controverted between the other Churches and the *Roman*, descending not so far as to particularize all other matters, which these Churches do or do not hold.

THE same may be said touching the silence of the Emissaries. The Emissaries have contented themselves in mentioning those Errors from which they have freed the *Nestorians*, without mentioning the new Doctrines which they have taught 'um; and this indeed concludes they have not bin obliged to introduce *Transubstantiation* amongst these People by way of dispute, being a Point, against which the *Nestorians* were prejudic'd; but this do's not hinder them from being oblig'd to bring it in by way of instruction, as being a Doctrine not comprised in their Ancient Religion, and which they ought now to receive, to the end they may become conformable to the *Roman Church*.

WHICH justifies it self by the conduct of the Popes themselves, who have sent the Emissaries, for they ever recommended to them this profession of Faith which we have so often already mention'd, and which expressly contains the Article of *Transubstantiation* in these terms, *Sacramentum Eucharistia ex azymo conficit Romana Ecclesia, tenens et docens, quod in ipso Sacramento, Panis verè Transubstantiatur in Corpus, & Vinum in Sanguinem Domini nostri Jesu Christi.* The Roman Church Celebrates the Sacrament with Unleavened Bread, holding and teaching, that in this Sacrament the Bread is really Transubstantiated into the Body, and the Wine into the Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ.

THE Popes have ever earnestly recommended to the Missionaries the instructing of the *Nestorians*, and other Eastern Christians according to this Formulary. They have sent it to the *Nestorian* Profelyte Bishops, enjoying 'um to have it continually in their minds, and to teach it their People, as we may see in *Raynaldus*. In the profession of Faith which *Timotheus* a *Nestorian* Arch-Bishop of the Isle of Cyprus made in the year 1445. not long after the Council of Florence, he was made to say that he confessed and approved of the Seven Sacraments of the Roman Church, and of the manner after which she holds, teaches, and Preaches them. And in the Reunion made in the year 1583. of certain *Nestorian* Christians of St. Thomas whom the *Portugaisers* found in the Kingdoms of *Cochin*, *Conlan*, and *Cranganor*, *Du Farrie* observes their Arch-Bishop was caused to profess what the Council of Florence had decreed touching the Doctrine which must be held concerning the Sacraments. He means without doubt that which was set down in the Instruction given to the *Armenians*, in which we see the Article of *Transubstantiation*. All which shews us they well knew the Necessity there was of introducing *Transubstantiation* into the *Nestorian Church*, to make it conformable to the *Roman*; whence 'tis not difficult to conclude that this Doctrine was not established in it before.

IN effect had the Emissaries and other travellers into these Countries found the belief of the Substantial Conversion established in them, 'tis not to be doubted but they would have proclaimed it to the World, and made this a Proof of the Antiquity of that Article. Mr. *Arnaud* would not have bin reduced to the Necessity of drawing a Proof from their silence, seeing they would have positively declared they found these People imbued

imbued with this sentiment, that the substance of Bread is changed into the proper Substance of the Body of *Jesus Christ*. The Popes would have loudly Gloried in it, and certainly there would have bin some Body or other that would have taken Notice of the contradictions of the Protestants in *Europe*: but instead of this neither the Popes nor Emiffaries make mention of this pretended conformity, and Mr. *Arnaud* Philosophises upon their not charging the *Nestorians* with their being *Calvinists*, and upon some passages of their Liturgies which are very uncertain, and which at bottom are of no consideration in respect of our difference.

*LEONTIUS* of *Byzancejus* recites a Discourse concerning these *Nestorians* from whence we may easily gather their Opinion touching the Bread of the Eucharist. They were very earnest (according to his Relation) with an Orthodox Christian to communicate with them, and this Person telling them he could not have Communion at the same time with the Catholick Church and theirs, they answered him, *that this need not trouble him because the Bread which is proposed as a Type of the Body of Jesus Christ contains a greater blessing than that sold in the market, or the Bread which the Philomarianites offered in the name of Mary.* 'Tis apparently seen these are not the expressions of Persons that believe the real Presence which the *Roman Church* holds. This shews they acknowledged no other effect from the Consecration than that of a Vertue of Benediction, or Grace, and 'tis also very Remarkable that in this Discourse they do not give any other title to the Bread of the Sacrament than that of the Type of the Body of *Jesus Christ*, in which they follow the expression of *Nestorius* himself the Author of their Sect, who speaking of the Bread of the Eucharist say's, *that the Body of Jesus Christ is the Original of it*, which is as much as to say that the Bread is a figure which represents this Body. And thus far concernig the *Nestorians*.

*Leontius Biz. advers. Nest. & Eutych. Lib. 3. Bibl. patr. tom. 4.*  
*Apud. Cyrill. alex. contra Nest. Lib. 4. Cap. 6.*  
See the Eight Chapter wherein are several passages of the Liturgy of the *Nestorians*, and *Indians*.  
*Lib. 5. C. 11. p. 508.*

AS to the *Maronites* their profession of Obedience, since so long a time, to the See of *Rome*, receiving their Patriarchs from the Pope, do's evidently exclude them from this dispute. Yet we cannot but observe how little exact Mr. *Arnaud* is, when designing to shew that the *Maronites* believed *Transubstantiation* and the real Presence even before their Reunion to the *Roman Church*, say's, *that Thomas a Jesu mentions an extract made by the Popes Legats of the bad Propositions they found in the Books of the Maronites, amongst which they comprehend the different Ceremonys, such as Communicating of both kinds, giving the Communion to Children. Yet in this Catalogue of suspected Propositions, there's not one relating to the Eucharist.* 'Tis certain Mr. *Arnaud* is mistaken, having perused this extract a little carelessly, for otherwise he would have observed three Propositions which evidently shew that these People did not believe *Transubstantiation*, nor yet the Substantial Presence. The first is, *That our Saviour Christ dips the Bread he gave to Judas, to the end he might thereby take off the Consecration.* *Christus intinxit Panem quem erat Judæ porrecturus ad Consecrationem tollendam.* We have already observed that this Errour must be grounded on this Principle, that the Bread is a Subject that receives Grace as a quality, which imprints its self in its Substance, and which may be effaced in washing the Bread. For what likelihood is there had they believed that the effect of the Consecration was to change the Substance of Bread into that of the Body of *Jesus Christ*, that in dipping the Bread the Substance of the Body of *Jesus Christ* would be washed off?

THE





Mr. *Arnaud* without Prejudice or Passion but consider a while the importance of this Proposition. For whether these People pretended we must read the Text, not, *this is my Body*, but, *this is the Sacrament of my Body*, or meant only that this was the sence we must give to the words of *Christ*, as the title of the Article insinuates. Is it possible that Persons who believed the substantial Presence and *Transubstantiation* of the *Roman Church*, should either make this correction, or seek this explication? Was there ever a one of the *Latins* that ever had such a thought in his mind, that we must not read, *this is my Body*, but *this is the Sacrament of my Body*? Do they not all on the contrary affirm that we must keep strictly to the literal sence? Let Mr. *Arnaud* consult himself hereupon, and tell us whether he could offer such a Proposition and whether he would not esteem it Scandalous and Heretical should any other propose it.

YET must we observe that *Thomas a Jesu* who recites the Extra $\text{\scriptsize ct}$  which the Popes Legats made, say's expressly that these Propositions which they found in proper terms in the Books of the *Maronites*, or received by the Publick Consent, and by Tradition, and which they condemned as manifestly Heretical, or Erroneous, or Superstitious, were *Errors common to the other Eastern Nations*, so that what we now Rehearsed concerning the *Maronites* must be extended in general to all the Schismatical Churches.

AS to the passages related by *Abraham Echellenfis* a *Maronite*, who was of the Seminary at *Rome*, Mr. *Arnaud* must bear with me if I tell him, (that considering the Character which *Gabriel Sionita* gives us of this Person, whom he perfectly knew, being both of the same Country, and having passed over a great part of their Lives together) he ought to be ashamed to offer any thing grounded on these kind of Testimonies, and to suppose us such Fools to give credit to the Relation of a Man so cryed down.

COME we now to the *Jacobites*, *Copticks* and *Ethiopians*, Mr. *Arnaud* brings again upon the Subject of these three Churches the same Negative Arguments drawn from the silence of Authors and Emissaries, which he used in reference to the *Moscovites*, and *Nestorians*, so that we need do no more than to return the same answers already made, and tell him that, if these People had the same belief as the *Roman Church* touching the Substance of the Sacrament, several Authors and Emissaries, would without doubt, have informed the World thereof; and make advantage of this conformity which they discovered between the *Latins* and them.

I shall tell him here again what he has bin told elsewhere that, when the Emissaries were sent to these People to instruct them, they ever carried along with them the profession of faith of *Clement VI.* which contained expressly the Article of *Transubstantiation*; that the Popes have sent it to their Patriarchs and Profelyte Bishops; and that when *Eugenius IV.* reunited to the *Latin Church* *John* the Patriarch of the *Jacobites*, he made him accept the decree of the Reunion of the *Armenians* which contains in proper Terms the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*.

*Raynald. ad.  
ann. 1442.*

BUT

BUT after all we may tell him it cannot be supposed the *Jacobites*, *Copticks* or *Ethiopians* were conformable to the *Roman* Church in the Doctrine of the Eucharist, holding as they do, that there is but one Nature in our Saviour *Christ* which is the Divine, according to the Opinions of *Eutiches* and *Dioscorus*. We cannot without charging them with the greatest Absurdity suppose they believe the Substance of Bread is really converted into the Substance of the Body of *Jesus Christ*, seeing they hold that *Jesus Christ* has not a Body, there being only the Divine Nature in him. Now that they hold this last Error, may be proved by infinite Testimonies.

*NICEPHORUS* a Greek Historian affirms the *Jacobites* assert, *Nicephor Call. Eccles. Hist. Lib. 18.*  
that after the Union there was only one Nature in *Jesus Christ*.

BROTHER *Bieul*, of the Order of Preachers, affirms the same in the Relation of his Travels, *The Jacobites*, say's he, are *Hereticks* and *Schismaticks*. They say there is in *Christ* but one Substance, one Operation, and one Will, which is the Divine. This is false and contrary to our *Catholick Faith*. For in *Christ* with the Divinity is a true Substance, Operation and Humane Will. For the true Faith is, that God was real God, and real Man. And a little further speaking of a Dispute which he had with them. We shewed them, say's he, wherein they erred, when they denied our Saviour *Christ* to be real God and Man, and yet would still retain and affirm that in *Jesus Christ* there was only one Substance, one Operation, one Nature and one Will which according to them is the Divine. *The wonderfull Hist. of the Great Cham of Tartar.*

POPE *John XXII.* writing to *Raymund* the Patriarch of *Ferusalem* complains to him of the *Jacobites* being tolerated in the Kingdom of *Cyprus*, and grounds his complaint on that these *Hereticks* dared maintain against the truth of the *Orthodox Faith* that there was but one Nature in our Saviour *Christ*. *Raynald ad ann. 1226. num. 28.*

*GUY Carmes* expressly observes this amongst the rest of their Errors, that they affirm there is in *Jesus Christ* but one Nature, no more than one Person, and therefore they make the sign of the Cross only with one finger. *Guid. Car. sum. de heres. iii. de Jacob. Barth. a Salignaco innot. terra Sancta fol. 31. de Jacobinis. Prateol. E. Incub. heret. Lib. 7. de Jacob. art. 3. Joann. Cottov. Itiner. Hieros. & Syriac. Lib. 2. Cap. 6.*

THE same may be seen in *Barthol. Salignac's* Voyages into the Holy Land. They hold, say's he, (speaking of the *Jacobites*) that there is but only one Nature in *Jesus Christ* which is the Divine.

THEY profess to believe but one Nature in *Jesus Christ*, say's *Prateolus*.

THEY are corrupted by several Errors, say's *Cottovic*, and especially in reference to our Saviour *Christ*. For they confound our Saviours Divine and Humane Nature, and make thereof but one Will and one Operation. They deny there was in *Jesus Christ* after the Union of the Word with the Flesh two Natures intire and perfect without confusion of Person. Moreover they maintain that the Flesh which our Saviour *Christ* took was not of the same Nature as ours, and that the Word was not changed into true Flesh, but into I



know not what kind of Phantastical and apparent Flesh, and that he rather seemed to be a Man, to be born and dye than really to do and be so. Thus do they teach that all the Mysteries of our Salvation, the Incarnation, Passion, Resurrection of our Saviour, his Ascension into Heaven, and his Second Coming, are only things feigned and appearances, and by this means make invalid all these Mysteries. And to confirm their Heresy by an external Testimony, they make the sign of the Cross only with one finger thereby representing that there is but one Nature in Jesus Christ.

Cottovic. Ibid.  
Voyages and  
Observ. of the  
Sieur de la  
Boulay le  
Goux 3. part.  
ch. 12. pag. 371

HE tells us the same thing of the Copticks. They follow, say's he, the Heresy of Dioscorus and Eutiches, which is common to them with the Jacobites.

THE Copticks are Schismatical Christians, say's the Sieur Boulay le Goux, and hold the same Errors as the Armenians, Jacobites, and Ethiopians following in every thing the Opinion of Dioscorus and Eutiches.

Thevenot's  
Voyages  
part 2. ch. 75.  
p. 501.

THE Copticks, say's Mr. Thevenot, are Christians but Jacobites, that is to say, followers of Eutiches and Dioscorus.

Thomas à  
Jesu. Lib. 7.  
p. 1. C. 13.

IT will be needless to produce any more Testimonies for the confirming a thing so well known that Mr. Arnaud cannot but acknowledge it: neither need we say much concerning the Ethiopians who are in all particulars like to the Copticks, and receive from them their Abuna, that is to say, their Patriarch, as Mr. Arnaud acknowledges. Yet will I here relate the Answers which an Abyssin Priest named Thecla Maria returned to the questions offered him at Rome by some Cardinals who Colloquy'd with him by order of Pope Sixtus V. in the year 1594. as we find them set down by Thomas à Jesu. Being askt, say's he, how many natures, wills and operations the Ethiopians held to be in our Lord Jesus Christ, He answered that the Ethiopians professed to believe only one Nature in Jesus Christ after the Union, one Will, and one Operation, yet without confusion, and he added he knew well that the Ethiopians, Copticks and other Eastern Christians that hold this Opinion deviated greatly from the truth. Being askt whether the Ethiopians believe one Nature in Jesus Christ resulting from two. He answered that the Ethiopians do not say so, but profess to believe that there is only one Nature in our Saviour without mixture or confusion, which they affirm to be the Divine. Being moreover demanded whether the Ethiopians received the Decrees of the Council of Chalcedon. He answered they condemned this Council, because therein was confirmed the two Natures in Jesus Christ, and that therein was Condemned Dioscorus the Patriarch of Alexandria. The Relations of Ethiopia confirm the same thing.

IT now concerns us to know whether all these Nations, to wit, the Jacobites, Copticks, and Ethiopians can hold Transubstantiation, that is to say, the question is whether they be People indued with common sense. For what can be more contradictory than to maintain on one hand that our Saviour Christ has no real Body, that there is nothing in him but the Divine Nature, that his whole converse in the World, his Birth, Death and Resurrection, were only bare Appearances without any Reality. And to believe on the other, that the Substance of Bread is really changed  
into

into the proper Substance of his Body, into the same Substance he took of the Virgin, and which he retains still in Heaven. Mr. *Arnaud* will tell us they hold *Transubstantiation* after their manner. But let him shew us then what this manner is. Will he have 'um believe the Substance of Bread is inwardly changed into the Substance of these Appearances with which they say the Divinity heretofore clothed it self? Besides that it would be ridiculous to attribute a Substance to simple Appearances which are nothing, and that according to them these appearances are no longer in being having ceased with the Oeconomy; will not this be excellent sence to say that the Substance of Bread changes it self into the Appearances which do not appear? for they will be concealed under the Vail of the Accidents of Bread, that is to say, they will be invisible Appearances lying hid under other Appearances.

WILL Mr. *Arnaud*, say they, hold the *Transubstantiation* of Bread into the Nature of the Divinity, which is to say that the Substance of Bread becomes it self the Divine Essence? But if it be true that these People hold so monstrous an Opinion, whence comes it that both Ancient and Modern Authors make no mention of it; never examined the Consequences of such a Conversion; have vehemently argued against the conversion of the Humane Nature into the Divine to shew that 'tis impossible, and not mentioned a word of this conversion of Bread into the Divinity? How happens it the Emissaries never discovered to the World so important a secret, never disputed against them on this point, nor the Popes ever made them abjure such an absurd Opinion in the reunions made between these People and the Church of Rome? Whence comes it the *Greeks* who have bin mixt with them, since so many ages never reproached 'um with this kind of *Transubstantiation* about which there may be great Volumes written? Mr. *Arnaud* who is so ready at arguing from the silence of all these People, Authors, Travellers, Emissaries, Popes, *Greeks*, &c. ought to inform us of the reason why not one of 'um has mentioned a word of this pretended change of Bread into the nature of the Divinity.

ALL this I think should oblige Mr. *Arnaud* to suspend a while his judgment touching Mr. *Picquet's* Letter which say's, *that all the Levantine Christians, who are Hereticks, and consequently such as have entred into a Confederacy against the Roman Church, yet hold as an Article of Faith, the real Presence of Jesus Christ, and Transubstantiation of the Bread and Wine into the Body and Blood of our Lord.* He ought at least to desire him to consult what they mean in saying there is but one Nature in *Jesus Christ*, and that the Divine one, and yet the Substance of Bread to be really changed into the Substance of *Christ's* Body.

The Contents  
of this Letter  
are thus related  
by Mr. *Arnaud*  
in his 12  
Book.

BUT this ought to oblige him likewise not to draw so lightly his Consequences from several Passages of the Liturgies which are attributed to these People, wherein the Eucharist is called the Body and Blood of *Jesus Christ*, and said to be truly this Body and this Blood. For besides that these Expressions import not *Transubstantiation*, as I have often proved, and shall farther prove in what follows, 'tis to be considered that we have no certainty that these pieces are real or faithfully Translated, seeing that in those few Passages which Mr. *Arnaud* produces, there may be observed a Remarkable difference. The Liturgy which is in the *Bibliotheca Patrum* under the Title of *Canon generalis Æthiopum*, mentions that the People say after the Priest has Consecrated, *Amen, Amen,*

H h h 2

*Amen,*

*Amen, credimus & confidimus, & laudamus te Deus noster, hoc verè Corpus tuum est, We believe it, We trust in thee and praise thee O Lord our God, this is really thy Body; but Athanasius Kircher otherwise relates these*  
 Mr. Arnaud words, *Amen, Amen, Amen, credimus, & confidimus, & laudamus te,*  
 Lib. 5. C. 13. *O Domine Deus noster, hoc est in veritate credimus caro tua. We believe thee,*  
 p. 518. *we trust in thee, we praise thee O our God, this, we believe is thy Flesh in truth.*  
 In one place the People are made to say they believe, that 'tis truly the Body of Jesus Christ, and here, that they believe 'tis the Body of Jesus Christ in truth. Now there is a difference between these two Propositions, for in one the Adverb *truly*, refers to the Body, and in th'other to the Faith of the People. This alteration is not so inconsiderable but that we may see by this Example that those who have given us this Liturgy which is in the *Bibliotheca Patrum* have not scrupled to accommodate their Translation as much as in them lay to the sence of the *Roman Church*, and to wrest for this effect the Terms of the Original. I never say'd this whole Piece was absolutely fictitious as Mr. Arnaud wou'd make the World believe. But only that that passage which speaks of the Elevation of the Host is a mere Forgery, and this we have proved by the Testimony of *Alvarez* and *Zaga Zabo*, one of which positively denies the *Ethiopians* elevate the Sacrament, and th'other declares they do not expose it. 'Tis to no purpose for Mr. Arnaud to endeavour to justify this alteration in saying perhaps there be different Ceremonies in *Ethiopia*, that they elevate the Sacrament in some places, and not in others, that they elevate it in a manner so little Remarkable that it has given Occasion to *Alvarez* and *Zaga Zabo* in comparing it with the elevation of the *Roman Church* to say they elevated it not at all, that is, they do not elevate it so high as to make it be seen, as is usual amongst the *Latins*. 'Tis plainly seen these are mere Subterfuges and vain Conjectures: Had *Alvarez* and *Zaga* thus meant they would have so explain'd themselves, and distinguished the Places, or the manner of the Elevation, whereas they speak absolutely. Mr. Arnaud do's not know more than these two Authors, and were he to correct or expound them he ought at least to offer something that might justify his Correction or Exposition. We may confirm the Testimony of *Alvarez* and *Zaga Zabo* by that of *Montconies* a Traveller into those parts, who describing the Mals of the *Copticks*, who, as every Body knows are of the same Religion, and observe the same Ceremonies as the *Abyssins*, say's expressly that they use no Elevation.

Answer to the  
 Perp. part. 2.  
 C. 3.  
 Lib. 5. C. 13.  
 p. 516.

Missa five  
 Canon uni-  
 vers. Ethiop.  
 Bibl. patr.  
 tom 6.

IT is then certain that this Liturgy such as it is in the *Bibliotheca Patrum* is an altered Piece, and therefore 'tis inserted in it without any mention whence 'twas taken, or who Translated it, as I already observed in my answer to the *Perpetuity*. Yet forasmuch as the Almighty taketh the crafty in their own Nets, there are several things left untouch'd which do not well agree with the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, such as for Instance is this Prayer which the Priest makes after the Consecration, commemorating, say's he, thy Death, and Resurrection, we offer thee this Bread and Cup, and give thee thanks inasmuch as that by this Sacrifice thou hast made us worthy to appear in thy Presence, and exercise this office of Priesthood before thee. Wee most earnestly beseech thee O Lord to send thy Holy Spirit on this Bread and Cup, which are the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ our Lord and Saviour for ever. Did they understand the Bread and Wine were the Body and Blood of the Son of God in proper Substance, would they say to him himself that they offer to him the Bread and Cup in Commemoration of his Death and



and Resurrection, and would it not likewise be impious to desire him to send on this Bread and Cup his Holy Spirit? 'Tis not to *Jesus Christ* himself that the *Latins* do offer his Body and Blood, those that believe the *Roman* reality do not express themselves in such a manner, much less can they desire of him to send down his Holy Spirit on them; for as soon as ever 'tis conceived to be the proper Body and Blood of our Lord in the sense wherein the *Latins* understand it, 'tis believed there is a fulness of the Holy Spirit in them.

I cannot but here relate what Mr. *Faucheur* has observed touching the *Egyptian* Liturgy commonly called *St. Gregory's*, by which will appear that the complaints we make concerning these pieces are not without cause. The *Egyptian Liturgy*, say's he, attributed to *St. Gregory imports*, *I offer to thee O Lord the SYMBOLS OF MY RANSOM. For there is in the Egyptian NICYMBOLON, that is to say τὰ σῦμβολα* *Faucheur on the Lords Supper. Book 3. C. 6.* as I have bin informed by Mr. *Saumaïse*, who has an ancient Manuscript of it, and not as *Victor Scialach* a Maronite of Mount Libanus has Translated it, (who being of the Seminary at Rome, designed by a Notorious falsity to favour the cause of our Adversaries,) *præcepta liberationis mea.*

BUT besides this way of corrupting the Liturgies by false Translations, it is moreover true that, when these *Levantine* Christians were Reunited as they often have bin with the *Latins*, the *Latins* never fail'd to examine their Books, and take out of 'um whatsoever they found therein contrary to the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*; for example, there has bin inserted in the *Bibliotheca Patrum* the Liturgy of the *Nestorian* Christians of *Mallabar*, but under this title corrected and cleansed from the Errors and Blasphemies of the *Nestorians*, by the *Illustrious and Reverend My Lord Alexius Menenses Arch-Bishop of Goa*. *Victor Scialach* in his Letter to *Velfernus*, on the *Egyptian* Liturgies called *St. Basil's*, *Gregorie's*, and *Cyril's*, say's, that the new Manuscripts have bin corrected by the order of the Holy Roman Church, into whose Bosom, as into that of a real Mother, the Church of *Alexandria* has lately returned under the *Pope*. *Missæ Christi. an apud Indos Bibl. patr. tom. 6. ed. 4. ibid bibl. patr. tom. 6.*

THERE's all the likelihood in the World that this Clause which appears in the *Egyptian* Liturgies of *St. Basil*, and *Gregory*, of *Victor Scialach's* Translation, and from which Mr. *Arnaud* pretends to make advantage, is an Addition made thereunto by the *Latins*, in some one of these Reunions; for if we examine it well we shall easily find that 'tis a confession of the reality of the Humane Nature in *Jesus Christ*, which is a confession directly opposite to the Error of the *Copticks* who only acknowledge the Divine Nature.

OBSERVE here the terms, *It is the sacred and everlasting Body, and the real Blood of Jesus Christ the Son of God. Amen. it is really the Body of the Emmanuel our God. Amen. I Believe, I Believe, I Believe, and will confess till the last breath of my Life that this is the living Body which thy only Son our Lord God and Saviour Jesus Christ took from the most holy and most pure Mary the Mother of God, our common Lady, and which he joyned to his Divinity without conversion, mixture or confusion. I make the pure confession which he made before Pontius Pilate, he gave his Body for us on the Cross by his own will. He has really assumed this Body for us. I believe that the Humanity was never sepearte from the Divinity, no not a Moment, and that he gave his Body to purchase Salvation, Remission of Sins* and

and eternal life for all those that shall believe in him. There needs no great study to find that the design of this whole Prayer is to confess the Truth of the Mystery of the Incarnation, and the reality of the Humane Nature in *Jesus Christ*, and that these words, *without conversion, mixture or confusion*, are precisely those which have bin ever opposed against the Heresy of the *Eutichiens* with which the *Copticks* are tainted. Whereupon we cannot doubt but that this is an addition of the *Latins*, who in reuniting these People to themselves have inserted in their very Liturgy, several Clauses expressly contrary to their old Error, that they might the more absolutely bring them off from it.

LET not Mr. *Arnaud* then any longer glory in these Eastern Liturgies, for if we had 'um pure and sincere, I do not question but we should find several things in 'um that do not well agree with the Belief of the Substantial Presence, nor with that of *Transubstantiation*. Neither has he reason to brag of the general Consent of all the Churches call'd Schismatical, with which pretence he would dazle the Eyes of the World. Upon a thro consideration of what we have so far represented to him whether in respect of the *Greeks*, or other Christian Churches, he must acknowledge he has over-shot himself, and bin too rash in his Affirmations on this Subject. Which I believe I have evidently discover'd, and in such a manner as nothing can be alledged against it. I dare assure him he will find in this dispute no Sophisms on my part. Having proceeded faithfully and sincerely in it. I have taken things as they lye in their Natural order. I have offered nothing but upon good grounds, from Testimonies for the most part taken out of Authors that are *Roman* Catholicks. I have never taken Mr. *Arnaud's* words (as I know of) in any other sence than in that wherein he meant them. I have followed him step by step as far as good order would permit me. I have exactly answered him without weakning his Arguments, or Proofs, or passing by any thing considerable. In fine, I have not offered any thing but what I my self before was convinced and perswaded to be true, and I am much mistaken if I have not reduced matters to that clearness that others will be no less perswaded of what I say than my self.

CHAP.

CHAP. VII.

*Mr. Arnaud's 8th. Book touching the Sentiment of the Latins on the Mystery of the Eucharist since the year 700. till Paschasius's time, examined.*

THE order of the dispute requires, that having refuted as I have done the pretended Consent of all the Eastern Churches with the *Latin* in the Doctrines of the Substantial Presence and *Transubstantiation*, I should now apply my self to the examination of what Mr. *Arnaud* alledges touching the *Latins* themselves from the 7th. Century till *Paschasius's* time exclusively, that is to say, till towards the beginning of the Ninth. And this is the design of the greatest part of his 8th. Book; and which shall be the greatest part of this of mine.

BUT not to amuse the Reader with fruitless matters, 'tis necessary to lay aside the first of his Proofs, which is only a Consequence drawn from the belief of the *Greek Church* with which the *Latin* remain'd United during those Centuries, whence Mr. *Arnaud* would infer that the *Latin Church* has believed *Transubstantiation* and the real Presence seeing the *Greek Church* has held these Doctrines as he pretends to have proved. We may reply in general that there can be nothing of solidity or certainty concluded from either of these Churches, whether we consider them since their separation, or during their Reunion. The *Latins* believed the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son, and they added the *filioque* to the Symbol long before the Separation of *Photius*; and yet the Churches continued United without disputing on these Articles, as they did afterwards. 'Tis the same in reference to several other points, and had not the interest as well of the Popes as of *Photius* bin concerned in this affair, 'tis likely both of 'um had continued a long time in the same state of communion together notwithstanding all these differences. 'Tis then a mere abuse to establish the Doctrine of the *Latin Church* by that of the *Greek* one, or that of the *Greek* one by that of the *Latin*, whatsoever Union there might have bin betwixt them. He that would be certain of their sentiments must consider each of 'um apart, and search for the belief of the Western Church in the West, and that of the Eastern in the East. Not but that I believe the *Latins* as well as the *Greeks* knew nothing of these admirable Doctrines of *Transubstantiation* or the Substantial Presence in the Ages now in question; but because I cannot see how there can be reasonably drawn a Consequence from the one to the other. And yet supposing the Consequence were good, it cannot but be in my favour, having shewed so clearly as I have done that the *Greeks* have not the same belief touching the Sacrament as the *Roman Church* has at this Day.

LET



Lib. 8. Ch. 1.  
Pag. 736.

LET us lay aside for this time the *Greeks*, seeing we have discoursed sufficiently on them, and come we to the *Latins* themselves. *I will undertake*, say's Mr. *Arnaud*, *positively to shew from Authors of these Centuries, that the Body of the Latin Church has had no other Faith touching this Mystery than that of the real Presence, and Transubstantiation.* I confess the undertaking is considerable and worth Mr. *Arnaud's* pains, but we must see how he acquits himself therein. For this purpose he has a long Chapter of preparatives whose title is, supposing the real Presence and *Transubstantiation* were constantly and universally believed during the seventh, eighth and ninth Century, how men ought to speak of the Mystery of the Eucharist according to Reason and Nature, and the ordinary way of their expressing themselves. This Chapter is full of long discourses, whose drift is to persuade us that provided we suppose the *Latin Church* firmly believed *Transubstantiation*, there being then no dispute about this Article we shall not be offended at several expressions arising from Sense which caused the Eucharist to be called Bread and Wine, the Substance of Bread and Wine, that it would be even contrary to Nature not to find in the Writings of these Ages any Traces of this Language of sense, and that a too great care to avoid it, would not at all agree with the state of those times. Moreover all which can be expected is that the Writers of those times have explain'd themselves in terms which plainly and naturally denote the Faith of this Mystery, and imprint the *idea* of it in the minds of all those which hear them literally. That the firm belief which they had of the *Reality* should only have hindered them from ever proposing any of the Opinions of the Sacramentaries. That as to the doubts which arise from this Mystery they have not wholly dissembled them, but endeavoured to satisfy 'em after a prudent manner, in saying the Eucharist is truly and properly the Body of *Jesus Christ*. That this expression explains and determines the simple expressions which affirm the Eucharist to be the Body of *Jesus Christ*. That they abridged their words and left something to be supplied by the minds of those they spake to. That the Mystery of the Eucharist being composed of two parts, th'one visible and th'other invisible, th'one sensible, and th'other intelligible, that is to say, of the outward vail which is the Sacrament, and of the Body of *Jesus Christ* covered with this vail, it may be considered in three manners. The first is to respect it directly, and the Body of *Jesus Christ* indirectly. The second is to respect directly the Body of *Jesus Christ*, and the Sacrament indirectly. And the third is to consider equally the Sacrament and the Body of *Jesus Christ*. That from these three ways of considering this Mystery there arise several different expressions; for according to the first it may be call'd the Sacrament of the Body of *Jesus Christ*, the Mystery of the Body of *Jesus Christ*, the Figure of the Body; and according to the second be said that the Body of *Jesus Christ* is contained in the Mystery, in the Sacrament, under the Figure of Bread and Wine, and according to the third that the Eucharist is both the Reality and the Figure. That 'tis Natural for a mans mind to apply it self to one of these particulars without denying the other. In fine, that as this Mystery comprehends several Relations, Customs, Benefits, and Senses which are engraved and represented in the Symbols, it must needs be very common with Authors of those times to apply themselves to the shewing the faithful these mysterious Significations, without concerning themselves about the explanation of the essential part of the mystery seeing 'twas known of all the World.

AND

AND this is the sum of this confused heap of Arguments with which Mr. *Arnaud* has stuf't the Second Chapter of his 8th Book. 'Tis evident he design'd by these Circuits propos'd with such a prodigious Perplexity of Words, to throw himself into a Labyrinth, and draw insensibly his Readers after him. For to what end is this heap of Suppositions, Propositions, Reflections, Distinctions, different Respects, Ways of Expression &c. with which this Chapter is cramm'd? Is *Transubstantiation* so deep sunk into the 7th and following Centuries, that we cannot get at it unless we pass thro' as many Turnings and Windings, as there were Porches and Doors in the Ancient Temple of *Jerusalem* before a man could come to the Sanctuary? Methinks this alone is sufficient to prejudice ones Mind against Mr. *Arnaud's* Cause; for had the *Latin Church* then believed the Conversion of the Substances, would she not have clearly explain'd her self? should we not have seen it appear in the Expressions of its Doctors, without giving a mans self all this trouble to find it?

MOREOVER how can Mr. *Arnaud* desire a man, before he judges of his Reasonings, and the Expressions of Authors in question, to suppose the Church then believed *constantly and universally* the real Presence and *Transubstantiation*, altho she never had seen any Controversy to arise touching these Articles? Is it fitting for those who are to decide a Question to prepossess themselves with Prejudices by Suppositions which do in themselves determine the Difference, or which at least must by a mans Judgment towards those things which are afterwards offer'd? If I for my share desired a man to suppose a Church which never heard any mention of the Substantial Presence, nor Conversion of Substances; that never believed these Doctrines, and were ignorant of all the Subtilties of the Schools on that point, my request would be more reasonable than that of Mr. *Arnaud's*: for till we are shew'd *Transubstantiation* has bin receiv'd in a Church, we may suppose this Church in a state of Nature in this respect. Now we know 'tis contrary to Nature to believe it. I know Mr. *Arnaud* would not fail to tell me we must not thus fill mens Minds with Prejudices, but leave 'um at liberty to judge of things alledged on both sides. This Supposition then which Mr. *Arnaud* would have us make is captious, far from being sincere, and tending to surprize mens minds, by making 'um take a part beforehand, without any ground or reason, that being thus prejudic'd, they may see what is not, and not see what is. For it is certain according to these two different Suppositions, the one, that a Church believed *Transubstantiation*, but never disputed about it. Th'other that a Church did not believe *Transubstantiation*, nor ever heard it, a man shall differently judge of the same Expressions. Upon one of these Prejudices a man will say, here's one of these defective Expressions mention'd by Mr. *Arnaud*, which leaves something to be supplied by the Hearer; and on the other, a man will say, here's an Expression which comprehends the whole Faith of the Mystery. In effect, hence proceed the different Judgments which the Catholicks and Protestants make on several Passages of the ancient Fathers, the one, believe they see *Transubstantiation* in 'um, because they read the Passages with this Prejudice, that the ancient Church held it, and the places consider'd in this respect confirm them in the thoughts which they have already entertain'd; the others do not find it in 'um, because they consider the same Passages with this contrary Prejudice, that the ancient Church did not believe it, and

these Passages considered in this regard make no Impression upon them. On the other hand there are Passages which appear very considerable for the Protestants against the Conversion of Substances, and which yet appear but weak and inconsiderable to the *Roman* Catholicks.

TO deal fairly in a matter of this Importance, it seems to me a man ought to compare these two Prejudices one with the other, and examine solidly which of the two is most just and reasonable. For this effect we must consider the Church, either as a Society of men, or as a Society of Christians. In the first respect it will be the greatest Absurdity imaginable to attribute to it the belief of *Transubstantiation*. If he held it, it would be in the second respect, I would say inasmuch as she is a Christian Society that has such Articles of Divine Faith, and particular Sentiments touching Religion which Nature do's not give. Now in this quality a man cannot reasonably prejudicate that the Church of the 7th. and following Centuries believed the Substantial Presence and *Transubstantiation* but by one of these two motives, either because he sees these Doctrines contain'd in the first and fundamental Rule of Christian Religion, which is the Word of God, or sees 'um already established in the preceding Centuries. If then Mr. *Arnaud* would establish his Supposition, he must begin by Inquiries into the Scriptures, and Tradition of the first Six Centuries, and shew therein the Doctrines in question; which done, he should descend to the Seventh and Eighth Ages, and make his Discussion on this Principle, that the Church at that time was in Possession of believing the real Presence and *Transubstantiation*. But he do's neither the one nor the other of these things. He begins his Discussion from the Seventh Century, and would have his Reader Judge beforehand from thence that the Church at that time held the Doctrines now in dispute. This is a plain Deviation and Illusion. For till such time as the contrary appears to us, we must always predetermine on Nature's side. Now the order of Nature is neither to believe the Substantial Presence, nor the Conversion of the Substance of Bread, so that unless the establishment of these Doctrines in the Church appears elsewhere, we cannot but suppose the Church, in what time and place soever we consider it, in a State purely Natural in this respect.

WE E can never, reasonably predetermine, without some considerable motive, contrary to that common Light which regulates the judgments of men, nor contrary to Universal Notions, and general Customs. Now 'tis certain that these three things oppose the Doctrines in question. For our Senses give in their Testimony against them, and Reason carry us rather away from 'um than to 'um. Universal Notions give us quite different *idea's* than those which these Doctrines constrain us to have, and the common Custom is to judge of sensible things according to their Natural Characters.

WE E ought never to prejudicate, without exceeding great reason, against an example, I mean against the usual manner of proceeding, acting, thinking, or speaking, in such like matters as is this in question. Now the Example of all People and especially of Christians shews, they conceive the Mysteries or Sacraments, without imagining any Conversion of Substance in 'um, that they give to signs the names of the things which they represent, to distinguish Mysteries from Miracles properly so called,



not to offer Miracles wrought on sensible things, and which are yet not only imperceptible to the Senses, but also contrary to their Deposition.

WHEN the Question concerns a particular Doctrine which goes to the making up of a part of the Body of a Religion, a man ought never to prejudicate lightly against that which we call the Analogy, that is to say, the Relation, Coherence and just Proportion which ought to be Naturally between the Doctrines, Maxims, and Customs of the same Religion. For 'tis with Religion as with the several Parts of a Building, or Edifices of the same City, or Members of the same Body, or if you will, as with Children of the same Family. They are known by one another, because they all do in some sort resemble each other; now if we consider the Christian Religion in the State wherein it was in the Seventh and Eighth Centuries, we shall find it full of Explications and Mystical Expressions; for this is the true Character of the Divinity of those Days. We shall find perpetual Discourses of that Spiritual Communion which we have with *Jesus Christ*, and immediate Manducation of his flesh as an Act of the Soul, and of a thing that belongs only to the Faithful. We shall not find they considered any more than two States in our Saviour *Christ*, to wit, that of his Abasement, and that of his Exaltation, without ever mentioning this third State call'd Sacramental.

WE shall not find 'um applying to the Sacrament of the Eucharist, several Passages of the Old Testament, which might be easily made to point at it, and which several Doctors of the *Roman Church* at this day do in effect make to relate unto *Transubstantiation*. It will not be found they have taken several Terms in the Sence wherein they must be taken upon the Supposition of *Species*; for Accidents without a Subject, of *Spiritually* to denote an Existence after the manner of a Spirit, of the Vail of the Sacrament or Figure of Bread to signifie a bare Appearance of Bread that covers the Substance of the Body of *Jesus Christ*, of *Corporeal Presence*, for a Presence after the manner of a Body, by Opposition to the Presence of this same Body after the manner of a Spirit. It is plainly seen they have forced and exaggerated the Expressions of the Scripture on the Subject of Baptism, the Church, the Poor, the Gospel, at least as vehemently as those that are to be met with in the Scripture touching the Eucharist. We shall not find they have made on the Subject of the Sacrament either the Distinctions, Observations or Questions, which Persons prepossessed with the belief of the Conversion of Substances ought necessarily to have made, without being obliged thereunto by Disputes. Nor, in a word, the proper and inseparable Consequences of this Doctrine, but on the contrary several things exactly contrary to it. Now this is what I call Analogy or Relation which the parts of a Religion have with one another, and against which I say 'tis not Rational to prejudicate.

'TIS certain we ought not only not to prejudicate against all these things, but on the contrary predetermine in their favour, seeing the prejudice which all these things form is so strong that we must have on the other side a very great Evidence to surmount it. Especially if we examine the Centuries that preceded the seventh, whereunto likewise may be applied the same Observations which I now made, whence arise the like Prejudices in respect of those Ages, and this Prejudice joining it

self to that which we have established touching the Seventh and Eighth Centuries do only fortify it yet more.

TO all which we may add that there is, to speak morally, a kind of Contradiction between the parts of Mr. *Arnaud's* Supposition. He would have us imagine the Church of the Seventh and following Ages firmly believed the real Presence and Conversion of Substances, altho these Doctrines were never disputed of therein, nor so much as questioned. But 'tis very improbable the Church remain'd Seven or Eight hundred years without any Contest touching this Article, supposing she held it. There have bin in this Interval of time several Controversies touching the principal Points of the Christian Religion, on Articles against which Nature do's less rise than against that of which we speak, and which moreover are found clearly established in the Word of God. How comes it to pass there has bin none on this? There have bin even several Disputes in which there has bin occasion of mentioning the Doctrines of the real Presence and *Transubstantiation*, which could not be without some Contest on this Subject. Such were the Controversies of the *Valentinians*, *Marcionites*, *Manichees*, *Millenaries*, *Encratites*, *Arians*, *Originists*, *Eutychiens*, *Ascodrupites*, and of I know not how many others, which must unavoidably produce Debates on the Eucharist had the Belief which the *Roman* Church has at this day bin then introduced into Christianity. It being then certain as it is, that the Church was in peace in this respect during all these Centuries, 'tis a token that the Doctrines in question were therein unknown, and this very Consideration overthrows Mr. *Arnaud's* Prejudice, and confirms ours.

MR. *Arnaud* will say, without doubt, we must suppose the Church of the seventh and eighth Centuries to be in the same Condition wherein lay that of the eleventh, which condemned the Doctrine of *Berenger*. But besides, that there are several things which may be alledged concerning this Condemnation, it not being true then men believed constantly and universally *Transubstantiation*, nor the real Presence, as may be justified by several Inductions, there being no likelihood in the first Condemnations of *Berenger*, *Transubstantiation* was established, seeing 'twas established in the Council of *Rome* held under *Nicolas II.* wherein he was condemned for the fifth time, according to the Authors of the Office of the Holy Sacrament, as we have already observed; 'tis an apparent Illusion to design the grounding of any Prejudication on this, seeing we find in the ninth Century a formal Contest which arose on this Subject; and that even this makes the principal Point of our Difference, to wit, whether there has hapned any change therein. Before then the Condition of the eleventh Century can be made to serve for a Principle to conclude from thence the Condition of the seventh and eighth, the Question concerning the Change must be first decided, for whilst we be in this Contest, there can be no Consequence drawn hence. It would be a very pleasant thing for a man to prejudicate against the Change which we pretend, by the seventh and eighth Century as believing *Transubstantiation*, and at the same time to prejudicate for *Transubstantiation* in the seventh and eighth Centuries, because 'twas believed in the eleventh, which is to say, to draw the Principle from the Conclusion, and then the Conclusion from the Principle, in saying on one hand that *Transubstantiation* was believed in the eleventh Century, because 'twas believed in the Seventh and in the Eighth, and on the

the other that 'twas believed in the seventh and in the eighth, because 'twas believed in the Eleventh.

LET Mr. *Arnaud* then if he pleases make another System, for all this great preparation of Observations and Propositions falls to the ground as soon as ever we deny him the Supposition he made, and shewed him the injustice and unreasonableness of it. As to this pretended contrariety of the Language of Sense with that of Faith, 'tis a thing we have already confuted. Should our Senses take upon 'um to tell us the Eucharist was only Bread and Wine, or mere Bread and Wine, our Faith would not bear this Language. This is not the Language of the Church. But when our Senses only tell us 'tis Bread and Wine, this Language is in truth different from that of Faith, which tells us 'tis the Body of *Jesus Christ*, but 'tis not contrary to it; for Faith receives and approves it in the manner wherein the Senses conceive it, which is to say, 'tis real Bread and real Wine in a literal sense, and without a figure. *That which you have seen on the Altar*, say's St. *Augustin*, and after him *Bede* an Author of the eighth Century is Bread and Wine, and this your Eyes tell you, but the instruction which your Faith requires is, that the Bread is the Body of *Jesus Christ* and the Cup his Blood. So that here, we have the two Languages both of Sense and of Faith, but that of Faith do's not contradict that of Sense, on the contrary Faith receives the Language of Sense without Explication and Figure. For whosoever say's the Eucharist is Bread and Wine, which our Eyes likewise shew us, means 'tis real Bread and Wine in Substance, for this our Eyes shew us in a most proper and literal sense. If St. *Augustin* and *Bede* find some Appearance of contrariety between the Language of Sense, which bears 'tis Bread, and that of Faith which will have this Bread to be the Body of *Jesus Christ*, the difficulty lyes not in the Testimony of Sense, as if we need call its truth in question, but in the Body of *Jesus Christ*, which being Flesh assumed of the Virgin, which suffered the Death of the Cross, and was exalted up into Heaven, that Bread should be say'd to be this Body. *This thought may arise*, say's St. *Augustin*, and *Bede* after him, in the mind of some Persons, we know whence our Lord *Jesus Christ* has taken his Flesh, to wit, of the Virgin Mary, we know he was suckled in his Infancy, educated, grew up in years, suffered the Persecution of the Jews, was nay'd to the Cross, put to Death, Buried, rose the third Day, and Ascended into Heaven when he pleased, whence he is to Descend to judge both the living and dead, and that he is now sat down at the right hand of the Father. How then is the Bread his Body, and the Cup his Blood? They do not say, how shall we not believe what our Senses assure us? Shall we doubt of the truth of their Testimony? On the contrary they suppose this Testimony to be certain, and ground the difficulty on the Body of *Jesus Christ* which cannot be Bread. The Explication of the difficulty and the reconciliation of the two Propositions are not built on the Error of the senses, nor the Interpretation which ought be given to their Language, in saying the Eucharist is called Bread because it appears to be so, or because 'twas Bread before its Consecration. But from the Nature of the Sacraments, wherein there are two Ideas both of 'um true, the one of our Senses, and the other of our Understanding. My Brethren, say they, these things are called Sacraments because we see therein one thing, and understand another. That which we see, has a Corporeal Species, that which we understand, has a Spiritual Fruit. As if they had say'd, as to what concerns our Eye-sight 'tis really Bread and Wine, but in respect of our Understanding 'tis the

*August. serm.  
ad Infant.*



the Body of *Jefus Christ*. So that if there' must be any thing figurative in either of the two Propositions, it must be in the Language of Faith, and not in that of Sense, which bears neither Difficulty nor Exposition.

Book 3. Ch. 1.  
p. 739.

*ALL that we can expect from them, say's Mr. Arnaud (that is to say, from Authors of the seventh and eighth Century,) is that, when they speak of this Mystery according to Faith and Truth, they should explain themselves according to those Terms which plainly and naturally express it, and which imprint the Idea of it in all those which hear them literally.* That which may be expected from Persons believing and teaching the Conversion of the Substance of Bread, whether it has bin disputed on or no, is, that they declare it in precise and formal Terms. Which I have already shew'd on the Subject of the *Greeks* by this reason, that the Doctrine of the Conversion of Substances determins the general Sence of these Expressions, the Bread is made the Body of *Jefus Christ*, the Bread is changed into the Body of *Jefus Christ*, that it gives them a particular Sense, and forms of it self a distinct, and precise *Idea*; whence it follows that when the question is about teaching of it, and a man has directly this Intention, he cannot but express it in clear and plain Terms, which answer the *Idea* he has of it, and makes thence the same to spring up in the Minds of the Hearers. It cannot be denied but this Conversion, and Substantial Prefence are of themselves very difficult to be conceived and hard to be believed, because all the lights of Nature are contrary to 'um, and there is nothing convictive in Holy Scripture to establish 'um. How then can a man conceive that a Church which holds 'um, or designs to Preach 'um to its People, do's not explain it self about 'um at least in precise and formal Expressions? Reason forces us to say she ought to endeavor to establish them by the strongest Proofs she was able; for supposing the Schools had never disputed concerning 'um, and no Person had ever declared against 'um, yet Nature itself which is common to all men, do's sufficiently enough oppose them to oblige the Church, he speaks of, to defend them from their Attacks, and fortify them against their Oppositions. But granting Mr. Arnaud the Authors of the seventh and eighth Centuries were in this respect extremely negligent; who can imagine they really intended to teach the Substance of Bread was really converted into the Substance of the Body of *Jefus Christ*, when they express themselves only by general and ambiguous Terms which need so many Commentaries and Supplements?

*BUT, say's Mr. Arnaud, we have reason to believe that being Men*  
Ch. 1. p. 742. *and indued with Humane Inclinations, they had that also of abridging their Words, and leaving something to be supplied by them to whom they spake.* I know several People of a contrary Humour, and yet are men, as appears by other Humours they have. But this Proposition has no other foundation but Mr. Arnaud's Imagination. He offers it without any Proof, and I may reject it without farther examining it. Yet let me tell him that in the Explication of Mysteries of Religion, Men are not wont to use these half Sentences, unless when they treat of a Point indirectly and occasionally, and not when they expressly and designedly fall upon the explaining of what we must know and believe. What strange kind of ways then had they in those Times, to express themselves only in half Sentences, when they design'd to explain the Mystery of the Eucharist? This Custom lasted a great

great while, seeing it was so for near two hundred years; and who told Mr. *Arnaud* the Ministers were not now and then tempted to assert things clearly and speak what they thought, or at least that the People were not wearied with continual supplying what was wanting in the Expressions of their Ministers, or in fine that none of these Customs were lost? Mr. *Arnaud* complains we make use of Raillery sometimes to refute him, but why do's he not then tell us things less ridiculous? For to speak soberly, to undertake to prove *Transubstantiation* and the real Presence by the silence of him that teaches on one side, and by the Supplement of him that hearkens on the other is not very rational. Yet to this pass may be reduced his manner of arguing should his Maxim take place, the Fathers of the seventh and eighth Centuries have say'd such and such a thing with Reticency. Now the People have understood them in such and such a manner by a supplement. Therefore they taught and believed the real Presence and *Transubstantiation*. How can a man consider this seriously? Mr. *Arnaud* will tell us there's nothing more common in Humane Speech than to use half Sentences; nor any thing more usual than to supply what is wanting to 'um. We are wont to say, a Man, a House, a City, the Air, the Earth, the Sun, and not the Substance of a Man, the Substance of a House, &c. But here is a great deal of difference. For here we use these Expressions because we suppose those to whom we speak have eyes and the use of their reason, and that these easily supply what is wanting in words. Nay when we use these terms even in a figurative sense, we do not explain them, because we know that sense and reason which are common lights to those that speak, and hear, will sufficiently explain them. But 'tis not the same in reference to the Eucharist, for supposing there's made in it a real Conversion of the inward Substance of the Bread into the inward Substance of the Body of *Jesus Christ*, Sense and Reason lead us not to understand this Change, seeing 'tis imperceptible, and contrary to the order of Nature; and we cannot supply by their means what is imperfect in the Words. Neither can this Supplement come from the Word of God, for it is pretended these terms which our Saviour used in the institution of the Sacrament have themselves need of being explained and determined by that which is called the sense of the Church. Neither can it come from the Tradition of the preceding Ages, for besides that the People have little knowledge of this Tradition, we shall not find any thing more precise in the instructions of the first Six Ages, than in those of the seventh and eighth. Whence then must this Supplement come? Must we here suppose secret and immediate Inspirations, or imagine there were certain short forms of speech then in use, and which served as a key for the understanding of the Publick teachings? Unless 'twere so I cannot see how Mr. *Arnaud's* System can hold. For to say that by a Prophetick Spirit they of the seventh and eighth Centuries knew what would be determin'd in the eleventh, and supplied what was wanting by means of this Prescience, this is something hard to be believed, and I know not whether Mr. *Arnaud* is willing to go so far; 'tis then clear that this pretended Supplement is a mere Whimsy, and as ill contrived and maintained as ever any thing was.

AS to those two parts which compose the Mystery of the Eucharist, the one the external Vail which is the Sacrament, and th'other the Body of *Jesus Christ* which is covered with this Vail, this is not a place for a  
thro

Chap. 2.  
Pag. 743.

P. 743.

thro-examination of this Hypothesis. Yet methinks Mr. *Arnaud* advances something singular enough when he adds, *that 'tis fruitless to enquire into the Nature of this veil, it being sufficient to know that it is Bread and Wine according to Appearance*, which is to say, if I be not mistaken, that 'tis needless to enquire whether this Appearance of Bread which covers the Body of *Jesus Christ* is a mere Phantasm, a pure Illusion which our Senses suffer, or whether they be really the Accidents of Bread which subsist separate from their Substance. Let the Gentlemen of the *Roman* Church determine whether this Doctrine be according to their Councils, especially that of *Constance*. As to my part I shall only tell Mr. *Arnaud* he will not find this Appearance of Bread and Wine, in what sort soever he Understands it, in the Fathers of the seventh and eighth Centuries, nor that the Body of *Jesus Christ* is hid under the Veil of this Appearance. The instance he gives us of a Man that is composed of Body and Soul, is vastly different; the Soul is not an invisible and impalpable Body, 'tis a real Spirit; and the Body is not an appearance of a Body, that has nothing of reality in it; it is a Body in Propriety of Nature and Substance. When then we say of a Man that he is an immortal and spiritual Being in respect of his Soul, or that he is a mortal and corporeal Being, in respect of his Body, or that he is mortal and immortal, considering him as a Body and Soul joyned together, this Language is Natural and easie to be understood without any Explication; because the Principles on which it is established, are obvious to Reason; and we may well suppose that those to whom we direct our Discourse are not Ignorant of them. But if Mr. *Arnaud* will have the Expressions of the Fathers of the seventh or eighth Centuries to be grounded on these Principles of the Appearance of Bread, which in truth is not Bread and the Body of *Jesus Christ* concealed invisibly under this Veil, he must without any more ado shew us that these Principles were known to the People, for it cannot be supposed they knew 'um Naturally. And thus his Instance is not at all to the purpose.

CHAP.



## C H A P. VIII.

*An Examination of these Expressions of the Fathers, That the Eucharist is the Body of Jesus Christ, the proper Body of Jesus Christ, properly the Body of Jesus Christ, the very Body of Jesus Christ, the true Body, or truly the Body of Jesus Christ.*

**I**T is now easie to perceive that all these preparations, with which Mr. Arnaud would clog his Readers mind, is only a handsom excuse for the weakness of his proofs; and an authentick declaration that he could not find the Doctrine of Transubstantiation, and the Real Presence in Authors of the 7th. and 8th. Centuries: for had he any thing to alledg that was considerable, 'tis evident he would never have taken so many circuits; and this is a certain sign, that these Doctrines were neither established nor known in the Church, during those ages; and this will appear more clearly if we cast our eyes on the passages he has produc'd, there being never a one of 'em that precisely contains the Conversion of the substance of Bread, or substantial Presence of the Body of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist, nor from whence they can be necessarily inferred.

**FIRST**, They cannot be infer'd from all those clauses of the Liturgies which term the Eucharist, *the Body of Jesus Christ*; and Mr. Arnaud could not busie himself to less purpose than to collect, as he has done, all these passages drawn from the Roman Order, the Liturgy called *The Mass of Illyricus*, *The Book of the Sacraments*, which Menard a Benedictin Monk published. Not to say the Book of the *Roman Order*, as we have it at this day is a Treatise made by an Author of the 11th. Century, as appears by the Testimony of *Honorius D' Autun*, who attributes it to *Bernoldus*, or *Bernoldus* a Priest of *Constance* that lived in the time of *Henry IV.* which was towards the end of the 11th. Century. This *Bernoldus* is he that continued the Chronicle of *Hermannus Contractus* to the Year 1100. and wrote several Tracts in defence of Pope Gregory VII. which shews us that his Book cannot be alledged in this Dispute. So likewise *Morin* acknowledges 'twas written after the Year 1000. And *Menard* who will not have *Bernoldus* to be the Author, yet grants he was the Corrector of it; and that he put in and out, what he thought good, to make it more according to the relish of the Church in his time. Neither shall I insist upon the Liturgy published by *Illyricus*, being a very uncertain piece, either as to its antiquity, or purity, as *Menard* has observed.

Honor. August.  
de Script. Eccl.  
Joan. Morin.  
Exercit. 9. de  
Diacon. cap. 1.  
pag. 169. col. 2.  
h. 5.

Menard Pres.  
in lib. Sacram.  
Gregor.

**BUT** not to enter into this discussion, it suffices me to say that the name of the Body of Jesus Christ attributed to the Eucharist, does no wise conclude what Mr. Arnaud pretends, which is, that 'tis the Body of Jesus Christ in proper substance. Does he think we have forgot so many illustrations which the Fathers, even those of the 7th. and 8th. Century have given us touching this way of speaking: as for instance what *S. Isidor* says, *That by the command of Christ himself, we call Body and Blood that, which being the Fruits of the Earth, are sanctified and become a Sacrament.* And elsewhere, *The Bread is called the Body of Jesus Christ, because it strengthens the Body; and that the Wine refers to the Blood of Jesus Christ, because it makes the*

1<sup>st</sup> ed. hisp. Orig.  
lib. 6. cap. 19.  
De Officiis Eccl.  
lib. 1. cap. 18.  
Bida Comment.  
in Marc. 14. &  
in Luc. 22.  
Id. in cap. 6.  
ad Rom.

K k k

Blood

*Blood in the Veins.* Bede holds the same language, *The Bread and Wine do mystically represent the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, because the Bread strengthens the Body, and the Wine produces Blood in the Flesh.* The same Author, on the 6th. of the *Romans*, teaches after *S. Augustin*, *That if the Sacraments had no resemblance with the things of which they be Sacraments, they would not be Sacraments; that 'tis by reason of this resemblance we give them the names of those very things which they signifie; and that as the Sacrament of the Body of Jesus Christ, is the Body of Jesus Christ, and the Sacrament of his Blood, his Blood, so the Sacrament of Faith is Faith.* One of these passages is a thousand times more considerable and decisive of our Question, than whatsoever *Mr. Arnaud* can produce from the Liturgies; because these passages are formal explications of these other expressions which attribute to the Eucharist the name of the Body of Jesus Christ; and any man of sense will never be prevail'd on by this confused heap of Citations wherein the name of the Body of Jesus Christ, or of the Body of our Lord is given to the Sacrament, as soon as he shall hear *Isidor*, *Bede*, or some other famous Author of those Ages in question, who explains to him these ways of speaking. We must rather believe those Authors when they expound themselves, than *Mr. Arnaud* who heats himself to little purpose, and would prepossess the world with his own notions and fancies.

MOREOVER, Can *Mr. Arnaud* imagine the world takes no notice of so many other expressions so frequent in the Liturgies, and Authors of these same Centuries, mentioned by us, which call the Eucharist, *the Sacrament of the Body of Jesus Christ, the mystery of our Lords Body, the Sacrament of his Incarnation, the Sacrament of his Humanity, the mystery of his Humiliation, the Sacrament of his Passion, the image of his Sacrifice, which the Church Celebrates in remembrance of his Sufferings.* It is certain that these passages wherein we find these expressions, are as so many Commentaries that help us to a right understanding of the others, whence *Mr. Arnaud* would draw advantage; because 'tis very ordinary and natural to give to a Sacrament, which is a sign, a memorial, and an image, the name of the thing which it represents, according to the observation of *S. Isidor* himself, *We are wont, says he, to give to Images the names of those things which they represent. Thus are Pictures called by the name of the things themselves; and we stick not to attribute to them the proper name. As for instance, We say this is Cicero, that Salust, that Achilles, this Hector, this the River Simois, this Rome; altho these are only the Effigies or Pictures of them: The Cherubins are heavenly powers, and yet these Figures which God commanded to be made on the Ark of the Testament to represent such great things were not otherwise called than Cherubins. If a man sees in a dream a person, he does not say I saw the Image of Augustin, but I saw Augustin, altho Augustin in this moment, knows nothing of this Vision; and Pharaoh said he saw ears of Corn, and Kine, and not the images of these things.*

*Isidor Com. in  
lib. 1 Reg. cap.  
20.*

*Be la hom. esau.  
de temp.  
Dom. 13. &  
Dom. 17. &  
Dom. 24. &  
alibi passim id.  
Expos. Alleg. in  
Cantic. Canic.  
cap. 3. & de tab.  
lib. 2. cap. 3.  
Aug. in Psal. 3.*

'TIS easie to comprehend the meaning of the terms of *Sacrament*, and *Mystery* of the Body of Jesus Christ, for they signifie, that the Bread and Wine are signs or figures that represent the Body and Blood which Jesus Christ assumed for our sakes; abasing himself so far as to be our Brother, and suffering the Death of the Crofs to Redeem us. Thus must we understand the title which *Bede* gives very often to the Sacrament, calling it *the mystery or the Sacrament of our Lords Incarnation*; for he means 'tis an action wherein by mystical Symbols men represent his Incarnation. We can-

cannot give another sense to that which he calls several times, *the Sacrament, or mystery of his Passion*; for his passion is only therein figured or represented. We must then understand by the *Sacrament or the mystery of his Body*, the figure or representation of his Body. And in effect what S. Austin said on the third Psalm, *That Jesus Christ gave to his Disciples the Figure of his Body*. Isidor expresses in this sort, *That Jesus Christ gave to his Disciples the mystery of his Body*. And Bede in two places of his works expresses himself in the same manner as S. Austin, that he gave the figure of his Body, which shews they took these terms, *the Mystery of the Body, the Sacrament of the Body, the Figure of the Body* for one and the same thing. Now these expressions give us easily to understand what the Church of those Ages pretended, when she applyed to the Eucharist the term of the Body of Jesus Christ; for she designed only to attribute the name of the thing it self to the sacred sign it represents: and there's no likelihood, that Authors of those times that made so scrupulous a profession to follow S. Austin, even to the copying out his Writings to insert them in their own in proper terms, as appears from Isidor's Books, Bede's, Alcuinus; I say there's no likelihood they would forget what their Master had said touching this Mystery, *the Lord scrupled not to say, This is my Body, when he gave the sign of his Body*.

Isidor. in lib. 2.  
Reg. cap. 3.  
Bede. quest. in  
2 Reg. & in  
Ps. 3.

Aug. contr.  
Adimant. c. 12.

'TIS to no purpose for Mr. Arnaud to urge the words of the Liturgy of Illyricus, *Præsta Domine Jesu Christe fili Dei vivi, ut qui corpus & sanguinem proprium pro nobis datum edimus & bibimus fiat nobis ad salutem, & ad redemptionis remedium sempiternum omnium criminum nostrorum*. Which he thus translates, *O Lord Jesus Christ grant to us, that having eaten thy proper Body, and drank thy proper Blood which have been given for us howsoever unworthy, that this Communion may be to us a spring of salvation, an eternal remedy for the redemption of us from all our crimes*. *Corpus & sanguinem proprium* do only signifie *Corpus & sanguinem tuum*, thy Body and Blood, not the Body and Blood of another, as the ancient Priests caused to be eaten the Body of a Sacrifice different from their own Body. For the Son of God who gave his own Body and Blood for us, gives us them to eat and drink in this Sacrament; not that our mouths receive their proper substance, the Liturgy does not say so, but because they receive the signs and tokens of 'um, whilst our souls receive this Body it self and Blood spiritually.

Ch. 3. p. 749,  
750.

'TIS moreover in vain that Mr. Arnaud would persuade us these passages of the Liturgies which term the Eucharist the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, do naturally imprint the Idea of a Real Presence. To prevent, says he, the peoples mistakes by all these terms of the Body of Jesus Christ, the Priests must have continually warn'd them to take notice that by the words of the Body of Jesus Christ, the proper Body of Jesus Christ, they meant only its figure. This sense must have been expressly explained in all the Liturgies, and an Officer appointed to make it thus understood by the people; for otherwise 'tis impossible but they must fall into the opinion of the Real Presence. And this effect being necessary and inevitable, it ought to have been the chiefest care and business of the Fathers to hinder it, had they not themselves been of this opinion.

Ch. 3. p. 751,  
752.

ALL this discourse has nothing in it but what may be easily answered. We have already sufficiently replied to it. 'Tis true this term of the Body of Jesus Christ taken separately imprints immediately the Idea of the natural Body of Jesus Christ, but this same term applyed to the Eucharist,

K k k 2

(which



(which both sense and reason shew us to be Bread, which Religion makes us comprehend as a mystery that represents the Incarnation and Passion of our Saviour) does not naturally form any other Idea than that of the Sacrament of the Body of Jesus Christ. There needs no Officer appointed on purpose to give notice of this to the people, *nor sound of Trumpet* to publish it, (as Mr. Arnaud speaks in another place.) Sense, Reason and the common notions of Religion were *Officers* sufficient to give this Idea, and publish this to be the sense of this term when applyed to the Eucharist. When the Scripture in an hundred places has called our Saviour the Sun, the day Star from on High, the light of the World, the true light that enlighteneth every man that cometh into the world, I do not find that it settled Officers on purpose to give notice, that it meant not a corporal Light, or Sun, but a Mystical one. I do not find the Jews employed an Officer to give notice to the people, that that Lamb commonly called the Passover, that is to say, the passage, was not really a passage but only the commemoration of a passage. S. Paul did not make use of one when he wrote, *that we are buried with Christ by Baptism, that we are made the same plant with him by the conformity of his Death and Resurrection, that we are new Creatures, that there is a new man formed in us*; and I know not how many other expressions which are easily understood by the bare consideration of the matter to which they are applyed. The Fathers have not employ'd an Officer when they called the poor, *Jesus Christ, Jesus Christ himself, the same Jesus Christ that shed his Blood for us, who was delivered and put to death for us, not his Prophets, but he himself*. Neither have they employed one when they called the Church, *the Body of Jesus Christ, the very Body of Jesus Christ, the real Body of Jesus Christ, properly the Body of Jesus Christ, the undoubted Body of Jesus Christ, the Flesh of Jesus Christ, Jesus Christ himself, not his Vestment, but himself*; nor when they said, *that we are one and the same person with him, the same Body, the same substance by Faith, that we are transformed into him, changed into his Flesh, changed into his Body*. Should Mr. Arnaud's Principle take place the world must have a great many Officers; for there's nothing more common than not only the metaphorical use of these terms, but even the exaggeration of them.

THIS moreover in vain that Mr. Arnaud has painfully collected into a Chapter for that purpose whatsoever passages he could find here and there not only amongst the Latines now in question, but likewise from amongst the Greeks, Copticks, Ethiopians, Armenians, Nestorians, which bear that the Eucharist is the *very Body of Jesus Christ, his proper Body, or properly his Body, his real Body, his true Body*. I shall reply to this heap of passages in two manners, first in general, and secondly in particular.

IN general, I say, there is not one of these expressions which is sufficient from whence solidly to conclude that those which have made use of them believed the substantial Presence which the Roman Church teaches, either because there is not one of 'um but is used on other subjects wherein evidently there's neither Transubstantiation nor the Real Presence, because they are all capable of another sense, and that they may have been employed in other respects than that which Mr. Arnaud attributes to them.

Hom. 15. in  
Rom.

To begin by that of the *Body it self of Jesus Christ*, we now see the Fathers have used this term on occasion of the poor, God, says Chrysostom, *has given his Son, and you refuse to give bread to HIM HIMSELF*  
who

who was given for you, who was slain for you; the Father has not spared him for your sakes, altho he was his only Son, and you neglect him altho he dies with hunger. And in another place, When we give Alms let us give it as to Jesus Christ himself, for his Word is more sure than our sight. When then you see a poor body, remember what he has said, that 'tis HIMSELF whom you feed. For altho that which appears be not Christ, yet is it HE HIMSELF that receives and asks under this shape. And moreover in another place, Somebody perhaps will say to me, bring me a Prophet and I will willingly entertain him; promise me then this and I will bring you a Prophet: what say I a Prophet? I will bring you the Master HIMSELF of the Prophets Jesus Christ our God, our common Lord. Know, says Valerian, that he whom you see naked, blind, and crooked is Jesus Christ HIMSELF. We have already likewise shewed that this expression is used by the Fathers in the subject of the Church. We are not enjoyed, says Chrysostom, to distribute our Corn, or Oats, nor to take care of Sheep or Oxen, or such like things, but to take care of the Body ITSELF of Jesus Christ; for the Church of Jesus Christ, according to the words of S. Paul, is the Body of Jesus Christ. S. Austin speaks often to the same effect, The Body ITSELF of Jesus Christ, says he, cries out in a Psalm, They have assaulted me even from my youth. And in another place, Behold the charity of our Lord, He is now in Heaven, and yet is in labour here below when the Church is in affliction. Jesus Christ is an hungred and a thirst, he is naked, a stranger, sick, a prisoner; for he has said, he suffers whatsoever his Body suffers, and at the end of the world when he shall gather together his Body ITSELF at his right hand, &c. And again in another place, You hold an eminent rank in the Body ITSELF of Jesus Christ, not by your Merits, but by his Grace. Jesus Christ HIMSELF, says he in another place, that is to say, his Body dispersed through the whole world preaches Christ. They cease not, says Sedulius, to rend by their Schisms the Lord Jesus Christ HIMSELF. Let us worship, says Damascen, the sign of the Cross, for HE HIMSELF is there where the sign is. His Body ITSELF, says Alcuinus, in the midst of the afflictions of this world glories and says, now my head is exalted above mine enemies. The Son is man, says Etherius and Beatus, he is the Head of his Church which is joyned to this Head, and so becomes whole Christ, that is to say, the Head and the Body one only person.

AS to the terms of *proper* and *properly*, we shall find them likewise applied to several subjects wherein we cannot literally understand them. Origen expounding those words of our Saviour concerning the Eucharist, This is my Body, Jesus Christ, says he, receiving always of his Father this Bread, and breaking it gives it to his Disciples, according to what every one of them is able to receive, saying to 'um, Take, eat; and when he fed them with this Bread, he shewed that 'twas his PROPER BODY. So Hefychius expounding these words of Moses, If any one has vowed and consecrated to God the Field of his possession, it shall be valued according to the measure of the seed: No body doubts, says he, but the Field is the holy Scripture. Jesus Christ is PROPERLY the Vine of this Field, and the Father is the Vine dresser. Despise not the poor whom you behold on the ground, says Gregory of Nyffe, as if they were vile and abject persons; consider rather who they are to know their worth. They are clothed with the person of Jesus Christ. For this gracious Lord hath given them his PROPER person. Good people, says S. Austin, are properly the Body of Jesus Christ. We might produce a thousand such like instances, for there's nothing more common in the

Fathers

Fathers than the use of these expressions in passages wherein there is no literal sense.

THE term *proper* has several significations. 'Tis true that sometimes it is opposed against *metaphorical* or *figurative*, an *improper* or *abusive* sense; as when we say of an expression that it must be understood, in a *proper* sense, that is to say, in a *literal*; but it is opposed sometimes to that which is *foreign* to us, which is not ours, which belongs not to us; as when we say, every man takes care of his *proper* business, *proper* house, *proper* family, *proper* person, in opposition to the affairs, house, and family of others. And then we scruple not to joyn this term to other metaphorical ones. We say for example of a man that misuses his Children, that he tears his own *proper* bowels; of a Husband that hates his Wife, that he hates his own *proper* flesh. It is in this sense *Clement Alexander* said, *The Church was the proper Spouse of Jesus Christ*. And *Gregory of Nyssa*, *That God formed our bodies with his proper hand*. And *S. Isidor*, *That the Law baptized with simple water, but our Saviour Christ initiates or consecrates us by his proper Blood*. Sometimes this term is opposed to that of *common*; as when we say to a man that 'tis of him we *properly* speak, that 'tis *properly* to him to do such a thing: or when we say that 'twas *properly* in such a place, or in such a time wherein such a thing hap'ned. And then moreover we do not scruple to joyn this term to other figurative terms, as when *Origen* said, *That God the Father is called properly the fountain of life*. And *Gregory of Nyssa*, *That those who at this day take upon 'um the office of Prophets in the body of the Church are properly called the eyes*. It is certain then *Mr. Arnaud* can conclude nothing from these expressions, unless he shews that these two last significations cannot take place in the passages which he alledges, and that we must unavoidably take them in the first sense; that is to say, for that which is literal and not figurative.

*Clement Alex.*  
*Strom. lib. 3.*  
*Greg. Nyss.*  
*Orat. 2. in illud*  
*faciamus homi-*  
*nem, & c.*  
*Isidor. Pelus.*  
*Epist. lib. 1.*  
*Epist. 397.*

*Origen Hom. 1.*  
*in Mat.*  
*Greg. Nyss.*  
*hom. 7. in Cant.*

THE terms of *true* and *truly* are likewise often used in occasions where, in they cannot signifie either a literal verity, or a reality of substance; and *Mr. Arnaud* does himself acknowledg that we find in the Fathers, *That Jesus Christ is truly the gate and house of Refuge, that he is truly the Rock and the Fire, that he is truly Bread, truly a Shepherd, truly an Altar; that his Incarnation is truly a flame, that he which imitates the works of Abraham, is truly the Son of Abraham, that the knowledg of God is truly a fountain; that he that meditates on the Law of God is truly a tree planted by the waters side, that Jesus Christ is properly and truly the light, that he is Noah in truth*.

TO hinder us from making advantage of these examples, *Mr. Arnaud* says, *That when of two things, the one stands for a figurative truth, and the other serves only for a figure, men commonly use the word true and proper when even the term to which 'tis joyned is metaphorical*. Thus, adds he, *We say the Christians be the true Israelites, that Jesus Christ is the true Melchisedec, that the Church is the true Spouse of Jesus Christ, that Jesus Christ is the true Sun, the true light, the true Vine, because that the carnal Israelites were but the figure in respect of the Christians, that Melchisedec was the figure of Jesus Christ, that the visible Sun is only the image of the invisible Sun, which is Jesus Christ, that the terrestrial Vines represent to us the celestial one, that humane Marriages are the figure of the union of Jesus Christ with the Church. And the reason of these expressions is moreover the same as that of others. For 'tis clear the thing figured contains more truly the quality denoted by the figure,*  
which



which has it only in representation. Let a man but read, says he moreover, the other examples, and he'll find that 'tis always the figure which is affirm'd of the thing figured, and that the word *verè*, which is thereunto added, signifies that this thing figurated does really contain the quality which the figure possesses only in representation: and therefore it is that these expressions cannot be changed. 'Tis said that Jesus Christ is truly a stone, that he is truly a door, truly the light, the true Noah. But we do not say the stones, the doors, the light, &c. are truly Jesus Christ. We say the Apostles are the true Israelites, but we do not say the Israelites are truly Apostles. 'Tis said that a good man is truly a Tree planted by the Rivers side; but not that a Tree planted by the River side is a good man. We may say then according to this sense, that Jesus Christ is truly Bread, truly Wine, because he possesses by way of excellency the qualities figured by the Bread and Wine; but we cannot say in this sense that the Bread and Wine of the Eucharist are truly the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ; because the Bread and Wine do not stand here for a thing figured, nor the Body of Jesus Christ for a figure.

THE first reflection to be made on this discourse is, that he refutes and overthrows the Argument which the Doctors of the Roman Church do commonly draw from our Saviours words in the 6th. of *S. John*, *My flesh is truly meat, and my blood is truly drink*: For if the term of *truly* may be applied to the thing figured, to signify that it contains by way of excellency the qualities of the figure, the meat and drink standing for a figure, and the Flesh and Blood of Jesus Christ standing for the thing figured, there's no longer any reason to conclude from these words that the Flesh and Blood of Jesus Christ are meat and drink properly in a literal sense, than there would be to conclude from thence that Jesus Christ is literally a Door and a Sun, Noah, and Melchisedec; that a good man is really a Tree, and that the Christians are literally Israelites under pretence there's used in 'um the term of *truly*. When then we shall be offered this expression of our Saviour, *My flesh is truly meat, and my blood is truly drink*, we need only desire that Mr. Arnaud may be the judg of this difference; for what he now said decides clearly the question in our favour.

IN the second place, supposing what he offers were absolutely true, yet the consequence which we draw from these examples would for all that be good and solid; for 'tis sufficient for us to shew that the terms of *true* and *truly* comprehend not always a reality of substance, and that very often they only signify a reality of virtue or quality. Now this is what appears clearly by these examples. 'Tis said of Jesus Christ that he is truly a Sun, a Stone, a Door, because the qualities of the Sun, of a Stone and a Door are in Jesus Christ, and that he has in our respect the virtue of all these things. Mr. Arnaud confesses it, why may we not then as well say, that the Bread of the Eucharist is truly the Body of Jesus Christ, by supposing that this Bread hath the virtue and efficacy of it? I grant it cannot be said of a figure that 'tis truly the original; this cannot be unless when we consider it as a meer figure under the respect of a representation only; but what hinders us from applying this term to a thing which has all the virtue of another, and which will make us feel all the effects of it, whether it be otherwise the figure of it or not? The Gospel does not contain the substance of the Body of Jesus Christ, but only its virtue; and yet *Etherius* and *Beatus* assert, that 'tis truly the Body of Jesus Christ. What is this *Ether. & Beatus lib. 1.* Bread, say they, which we every day pray for, which is ours, and which yet we

Com. in Psal.  
147.

we do not receive, unless we ask it? 'Tis truly the Body, know ye, 'tis he himself that is our daily bread. Ask it, receive it, eat it every day. Read we the holy Scriptures, and we shall find therein this Bread. I believe that the Gospel, the Scriptures, the Doctrine of Jesus Christ, are the Body of Jesus Christ: For when our Lord says, *He that eateth not my Flesh, nor drinketh my Blood, &c.* Altho these words may be understood spiritually and mystically, yet the daily bread which we ask corporally, and which is **TRULY** the Body of Jesus Christ, and his Blood, is the word of the Scriptures, the Divine Doctrine; and when we read it, we eat the Flesh of Jesus Christ and drink his Blood. The Author of the Commentary on the Psalms attributed to S. Jerom, has so little believed that, the term of *truly* applyed to the Eucharist, when 'tis said that 'tis truly the Body of Jesus Christ, ought to be understood of a truth of substance, that he has not scrupled, comparing the Eucharist with the words of the Gospel, to affirm that its words are more truly this Body. I believe, says he, that the Gospel is the Body of Jesus Christ, his holy Scriptures I say and his Doctrine. And when he says, *he that eateth not my Flesh, nor drinketh my Blood; altho this may be understood of the mystery, yet the Scriptures, the Divine Doctrine is MORE TRULY the Body of Jesus Christ.*

Chrysost. hom.  
11. in Rom.

**THIS** term of *truly* applies it self not only to a thing which hath the virtue of another, and which communicates it to us spiritually such as is the word of the Gospel in respect of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, it applies it self likewise to a thing which is not another, but only by imputation. Chrysostom speaking of a poor body, and calling him a man, corrects immediately his expression, as if it were not just. *A man*, says he, or to speak better *Jesus Christ*, ἀνθρώπου μᾶλλον ὅ ἰησοῦς, which his interpreter Brixius has thus rendred, *Hominem autem, seu verius dicam Christum ipsum*. In effect this correction μᾶλλον ὅ, denotes the sence of Chrysostom is, that a poor body is more truly Jesus Christ than a man, and yet it cannot be said he is truly Jesus Christ in verity of substance. He is only so by imputation; inasmuch as Christ our Saviour accepts whatsoever is done to the poor as done to himself. S. Hierom in his Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians uses the same term of truly on the subject of the Church, altho it be not the Body of Jesus Christ but mystically and morally. *The Church*, says he, *is taken in two respects, either for that which has neither spot nor wrinkle, and which is TRULY the Body of Jesus Christ, or that which is assembled in the name of Christ without the fulness or perfection of virtues, which Claud Bishop of Auxerrus, or rather of Turin, who was an Author of the 8th. Century, has inserted word for word in his exposition of the same Epistle, The Church, says he, which has neither spot nor wrinkle, and which is TRULY the Body of Jesus Christ.* The same expression may be met with in Bede, *As our Lord, says he, is the Head of his Church, and the Church is TRULY his Body, so the Devil is the head of all the wicked, and the wicked are his body and members.*

Com. in Gal. c. 1.  
Beda expl. allegor. in Tobiam.

IN all these examples I now alledged, concerning the Gospel, the Poor, and the Church, Mr. Arnaud cannot say that Jesus Christ, or his Body stand for a figure; nor that these things, stand for figured truths. For the Body of Jesus Christ is not the figure of the Gospel, nor our Saviour the figure of a poor man; and the Church, to speak properly, is not the truth figured by the Body of our Lord. Yet do the Fathers assure us that this Gospel, and this Church are truly the Body of Jesus Christ, and the Poor  
are

are truly Jesus Christ. Whence it follows, there's nothing more vain than Mr. Arnauds remark, *That we cannot say the Bread and Wine of the Eucharist are truly the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, because the Bread and Wine stand not for a thing figured, nor the Body of Jesus Christ for a figure.* On this Maxim the Fathers could not say the Church is truly the Body of Jesus Christ, and the Gospel truly this Body; nor that the Poor are truly the Lord himself; and yet they have said it as well as that the Eucharist is truly the Body. Granting Mr. Arnaud one cannot say a figure, as a figure, is really the thing it self which it represents, he can hence conclude no more but this, that what the Fathers have said of the Bread of the Eucharist, *viz.* that it is truly the Body of Jesus Christ, they did not say this in respect of the Bread being a figure; but this does not hinder 'um from saying it on other accounts, either inasmuch as that the Bread is accompanied with the whole virtue of the Body, or inasmuch as it communicates this virtue spiritually to our souls.

THERE are so many several respects wherein we may say the Sacrament is *the true Body*, or *truly the Body* of Jesus Christ, without any regard to its substance, that 'tis matter of real wonder to me Mr. Arnaud should so vehemently urge those terms, and pretend 'um to be such a great argument. For example, those that consider the Heresie of the *Marcionites*, and *Manichees* who denied our Saviour Christ assumed a true Body, and allowed only a phantasm, might not they say of the Eucharist that 'tis *our Lords true Body*, to signify it to be the mystery of a true Body, and not the mystery of a false and imaginary one, such as these Hereticks attributed to him, in the same sense as a Roman Catholick who has regard to the false Idea which the Jews form to themselves of a temporal Messias may well say of a Crucifix, or another image of our Saviour, that this is the true Messias who was to come into the world, in opposition to the fantastical Messias of the Unbelievers.

THOSE that respect the truth of the words of our Saviour, who called the Bread his Body, might not they likewise say, 'tis *truly his Body*, not to determine the sense of these words, but to establish only the certainty of them, and represent 'um true beyond all question, in the same sense in reference to prophane persons who scoff at the words of S. Paul, who tells us that *we are buried with Christ in Baptism, and made one and the same plant with him through the conformity of his Death and Resurrection*, I would not scruple to say that Baptism is *truly our death*, our Burial and Resurrection with Jesus Christ, to signify only that the words of the Apostle are very true, being rightly understood.

SUCH as consider the figures and legal shadows which represented the Body of Christ very imperfectly, which gave only a confused and obscure Idea of it, and communicated only faintly the virtue of it, might not they say, in comparing them with our Eucharist, that this here is *the true Body of Jesus Christ*, to signify that it gives us a true, lively, distinct and perfect Idea of it, that it fully communicates it to the hearts of the faithful, and makes it feel all the virtues of it, in the same sense as Cyril of Jerusalem comparing the ancient figures with our Baptism, did not stick to call this here the *truth* in opposition to the figure. *Pass we, says he, from old things to new, and from the figure to the TRUTH.* There Moses was sent from God into Egypt, here Jesus Christ who was sent from the Fa-

Cyrl. Hieros.  
Catech. myst. 16



ther, is come into the world. There Moses was sent to deliver the people from the oppression of Egypt; here Jesus Christ was sent to deliver us from the bondage of sin. There the Blood of a Lamb stopt the destroying Angel, here the Blood of Jesus Christ, the Lamb without spot or wrinkle, protects us against the Devils. There the tyrant pursued the people to the Red Sea, here the Devil pursues us as far as the salutiferous waters. There the Tyrant was drowned in the Sea, here the Devil is suffocated in the water of Salvation.

THOSE that considered the effect of the consecration of the Bread which makes it to be really, and not by a simple imagination, the mystery of our Lord's Body, might they not say that 'tis *truly* the Body of Jesus Christ, the Body of Jesus Christ in truth, not to insinuate it to be so in proper substance, but to signify its being the mystical Body of Jesus Christ, is not a thing which has no other foundation than our own imagination, but that which is grounded on the things themselves, either because our Saviour Christ has thus ordained it in instituting his Holy Sacrament in the Church, or forasmuch as the Eternal Father has ratifi'd this Institution, or that the Holy Spirit really descends on the Bread to consecrate it. An adopted Son considering his adoption was real, and not illusory or conceited, may rightly say that he is *truly* the Son of such a one; and in this sense every faithful person may say with assurance, he is *truly* the Son of God. 'Tis in this same sense that S. Basil tells us, *That if our flesh be worthy of God, it becomes truly his Tabernacle.* And Theophylact, *That the Jews were truly blind in respect of the Soul.* And Cyril of Jerusalem, *That we have been truly anointed by the Holy Spirit, and that Jesus Christ is truly the Primitia, and we the mafs or lump,* And S. Hierom, *That we be all truly one Bread in Jesus Christ.* For they would say, not that these titles of Tabernacle, and Blind, this Unction, these *Primitia*, this *Mafs*, and this Bread, ought to be understood in a literal sense; but that their metaphorical signification was grounded on the things themselves, and may be found entirely true.

THOSE in fine who consider the opinion of the Greeks, that the Bread is made the Body of Jesus Christ by an union with the natural body; and by way of growth and augmentation, may not they likewise say that 'tis *truly* this body, and yet not establish 'tis the same numerical substance which our Saviour has in Heaven; but to signify that this substance here, and that there, are not two different Bodies, but one and the same Body; as we have already more than once explained; in the same sense as the augmentations which are made to a House or Ground become *truly* this House, or this ground, or the Kings Conquests added to his Kingdom become *truly* his Kingdom, by virtue of their union.

ALL which clearly shews that Mr. Arnaud has much misreckoned himself when he believed there were but two occasions wherein men used these terms of *true* and *truly*, the one when they affirm the figure of the Original; as when we say that our Saviour Christ is the true *Melchisedec*, the true Son, the true Vine; and the other when we would prevent any kind of doubt or contest; as when we say of a suspicious piece of Gold that 'tis *true* Gold, or a Pope that has an Anti-Pope for his rival, that he is the *true* Pope. This enumeration is defective, and the conclusion which he pretends to draw hence is void, and refuted by what I now offer'd. The Fathers might say that the Bread of the Eucharist is *truly* the Body of Jesus Christ without intending the prevention of any doubt.

But

Basil. in Ps. 14.  
Theophyl. in  
Joan. 10.  
Cyril Hierosol.  
myst. 3.  
Hierom in Epist.  
ad Gal. c. 4.

Ch. 5. p. 780.

BUT supposing they designed to prevent a doubt; can there arise no other from the subject of the Eucharist, but what relates to Transubstantiation, or the substantial Presence? May not a man doubt of the truth of the Body of Jesus Christ considered in it self, and in reference to the Incarnation? All those ancient Hereticks, Marcionites, Manichees, have not only doubted of it, but boldly affirmed that 'twas only a Phantasm. The Eutychiens have affirm'd, and do still affirm, that this Body was swallowed up in the abyss of the Divinity. Cannot a man doubt of the truth of Jesus Christ his words? The Jews and Pagans do not only doubt of them, their impudence proceeds so far as to make a mock at 'um; and how many impious and prophane wretches are there amongst such as profess Christianity that mock at 'um in their hearts? Cannot a man doubt of the efficacy and spiritual virtue of this Bread? We have already observed from *Palladius* that this was precisely the doubt that possessed the mind of a Religious. And how many weak persons are there, who seeing only Bread and Wine, cannot imagine we ought to attribute to them so great an efficacy. *There is nothing, says Tertullian, that more perplexes mens minds, than to see the simplicity of the Divine operations when they are celebrated, and to hear the magnificent effects issuing from them.* *Tertul. de Baptismo. Ch. 5. p. 783.*

*THIS* doubt, says Mr. Arnaud, must have two qualities. For first, As this expression has been generally received by all people; this must therefore be a general doubt, and must naturally arise in the minds of all men. Secondly, As no body ever made use of this expression, but only on the subject of the Eucharist, this must be a particular doubt belonging to the Eucharist, and which cannot be extended to all the other Sacraments. How excellent is Mr. Arnaud at engrossing of objects. He has gathered here and there, from several Authors that lived in sundry Churches, and at divers times some thirty passages taken in a counter sense that speak differently, one in one manner, others in another, in different significations, and this he makes to be the language of all people, In another place, he assures us this is the language of all Nations and all Ages. A man cannot say an expression has been generally received by all people, and in all ages, unless he has run over the Authors of all Ages, and shew'd that this expression was received by the greatest part amongst 'um; for which purpose thirty passages gathered at random are not sufficient. Moreover the expression in question should appear in all the passages, and not one in some of 'em, and another in others. Besides the expression must be used every where in the same sense. But we find no such thing here. We have only about some thirty passages, in one of which there's the term of *same*, in another that of *proper*, or *properly*, in another that of *true*, or *truly*, and they are used in different senses too, as will appear from the particular examination we shall make of them. How can this then be called an expression generally received by all people, the language of all Nations, and that of all ages? For my part I call it an illusion. P. 774.

BUT supposing the expression of *true*, or *truly* to have been generally received by all people, as Mr. Arnaud supposes it was, why must it needs proceed from a general doubt that naturally arises in the minds of all men? May it not happen that the same expression has been used in divers ages and amongst divers people under different respects, and yet have been used for different ends, and on different occasions. 'Tis not good reasoning to conclude there has been an universal and uniform reason in all Ages and amongst

all people that has obliged them to make use of a term under pretence that it has been every where and at all times used. For how many ancient terms are there which are at this day in use, altho the reason of their being at first used no longer subsists? The use of terms is a thing unaccountable enough, and sufficiently subject to change, either in regard of divers People, or Ages, and the occasions, the reasons or principles of this use are no less unaccountable too.

SUPPOSING this expression has been generally received by a general reason, why must this reason be a general doubt that naturally arises in the minds of all men? Is it not sufficient that it was a general interest which all Christians had to establish the truth of the Nature and Humane Substance in the Person of Jesus Christ, and to make thereof a common confession in the Sacrament itself of his Incarnation, I mean in the Eucharist, for so the Fathers have called it? Is it not sufficient 'twas a general interest which they had in all places and in all Ages to receive with a profound respect the words of Jesus Christ, who has said of the Bread, *This is my Body*, and to acknowledge publickly the truth of them? These two interests are general, belong to all times, and all Nations, and are a sufficient reason of this expression in question, were it as general as Mr. Arnaud says it was.

BUT in fine, supposing it was a general doubt that occasion'd these terms of *true* and *truly*, I say 'tis sufficient 'twas a doubt likely to happen in the minds of weak persons, and not necessarily in those of all men. For there have been weak Christians at all times, and in all places, the Church having never been without 'um, and of whom there ought always to be a particular care taken. Now this doubt touching the virtue of the Eucharist, that it can spiritually communicate to us the Body of Jesus Christ, that it procures us the remission of our Sins, the Grace of Sanctification, the hope of Everlasting life, that by it we obtain the Communion of our Saviour; this doubt, I say, easily arises in the minds of weak persons, who, as I have already said, are sufficiently puzzled at the simplicity of this Sacrament, wherein there only appears Bread and Wine. Supposing then one should say that the terms of the *true* Body of Jesus Christ, or of *truly* the Body of Jesus Christ, were only used to prevent this doubt, to strengthen the weak in this regard, and conciliate more respect to the Sacrament, what can Mr. Arnaud find in this which is not reasonable, and conformable to the sense of the Church.

Page 783.

WERE there any body now, says he, *tempted with this doubt, and needed to be strengthened against it, does not common sense shew that he would express it in proper terms to make himself understood, and disacknowledg it by expressions which are directly contrary to it. He will say for example that he doubts whether God works on our souls by means of the Bread of the Eucharist, and whether he fills it with his efficacy. He will say that he does not doubt but the Eucharist is endowed with the virtue of the Body of Jesus Christ; but he will never think of expressing this doubt in these terms, I doubt whether the Eucharist be the Body of Jesus Christ, nor of rejecting it in these here, I believe the Eucharist to be the true and proper Body of Jesus Christ.*

LET Mr. Arnaud tell us if he pleases why these pretended doubters (whom he introduces without any occasion, or reason) would not consult com-



common sense whereby to express their doubt in intelligible terms, supposing they doubted of Transubstantiation, or the substantial presence. Why should they not say, *We doubt whether the substance of Bread be changed into the substance of the Body of Jesus Christ, or we doubt whether the substance of the Body of Jesus Christ be contained under the veil of the appearances of Bread.* Those that have now their minds possessed with these doubts, do they think of proposing them in these equivocal terms which need a Commentary to explain them, *We doubt whether the Eucharist be the Body of Jesus Christ?* Clear and proper terms are not so hard to be found, had the Church then believed the substance of Bread to be converted into the substance of Jesus Christ, and the common opinion it self against which they would form their doubts would have furnished them with requisite expressions. Let Mr. Arnaud likewise tell us why this doubt was not repelled in formal terms, by saying, *We must believe that the substance of Bread is changed into that of the Body of Jesus Christ, and that under the accidents of Bread is contained the proper substance of this Body.* Let him shew us from Antiquity his pretended doubt explained in requisite terms according to the sense he gives it, and I will shew him that which he finds so ridiculous stated according to my sense in Palladius, *How are the gifts, said a Religious person, able to sanctify me?* I will shew him that this is in effect the doubt which was heretofore design'd to be prevented, as appears by Cyril of Alexandria; God, says he, *changes the things offered into the efficacy of his Flesh,* Pallad. Hist. Laus. cap. 75. AND WE NEED NOT DOUBT BUT THIS IS TRUE: and by Elias of Crete, *God changes the things offered into the efficacy of his Flesh,* Elias Cret. in Greg. AND DOUBT NOT BUT THIS IS TRUE. Let him shew us the Fathers have said that the Eucharist is the true Body, or truly the Body of Jesus Christ, in reference to the question of the Conversion, and the substantial Presence, and I will shew him they have said it in reference to the question touching the virtue. For Walafridus Strabo, an Author of the 9th. Century, having given this Title to one of the Chapters of his Book, *De Virtute Sacramentorum*, says afterwards in the Text of the same Chapter, by way of confirmation, *That the Mysteries are truly the Body and Blood of our Lord.* And Rupert, altho he lived in the 12th. Century, that is to say, in a time wherein Transubstantiation had introduced it self into the Latin Church, yet said, *That the Bread is rightly called and is TRULY the Flesh of Jesus Christ, because in reference to us it effects the same thing as the Flesh of Jesus Christ, Crucified, Dead and Buried.* Moreover Mr. Arnaud has no reason to be so positive in affirming that the doubt was rejected in these terms, *I believe the Eucharist to be the true and proper Body of Jesus Christ*, nor to make the world believe that all Nations and Ages spake in this sort. The term of *true* may be met with in some passages which Mr. Arnaud alledges, and that of *proper* in others, and both of these are therein used in senses far different from that which he gives them; but he must not under this pretence form this proposition, *That the Eucharist is the true and proper Body of Jesus Christ*, for there's a great deal of difference between these terms being separate, (which offer themselves in divers passages, and in divers Authors) and these same terms joyned together by way of exaggeration. I confess that Nicephorus according to Allatus's relation joyns together the two terms of *properly* and *truly*; but besides that Nicephorus is not all Ages, nor all Nations; we have already shew'd that he speaks only thus upon an Hypothesis far different from that of Transubstantiation, or the substantial Presence; and therefore Mr. Arnaud cannot make any advantage of what he says.

And

AND these are my general answers to Mr. *Arnaud's* passages. Should we descend at present to the particular examination of these passages, we must first lay aside those of *Anastafius Sinait*, of *Damascen*, of the second Council of *Nice*, of *Nicephorus* the Patriarch of *Constantinople*, the profession of Faith made by the Saracens that were Converts of the 12th. Century, and that of the *Horologium* of the Greeks; for they have been all of 'em already sufficiently answer'd: 'tis only needful to remember what I have already established touching the real Belief of the Greek Church. There must likewise be retrenched those that be taken from the Liturgies of the Copticks and Ethiopians, seeing we have already answered them. We have also answer'd that taken out of the common Liturgy of the Armenians, or to speak better, the Armenians themselves have answer'd it.

*Apud Cassand.  
in Liturgicis.*

IF those of *Leopolis* call the Bread and Wine *the true Body and the true Blood of Jesus Christ our Lord and Saviour*, there is no likelihood for all this that they have another Belief than that of the rest of the Armenians, who formally declare, as we have already seen, that they mean nothing else by these terms, than a true mystery of this Body and Blood, and in effect it is said in the same Liturgy whence Mr. *Arnaud* has taken his Quotation, that the Priest says in Communicating, *I eat by Faith, O Lord Jesus Christ thy holy living and saving Body. I drink by Faith thy holy and pure Blood.*

THE passage of *Adam* the Arch-deacon of the Nestorians, mention'd by *Strozza*, is impertinently alledg'd, for two reasons: First, That these are the words of a man that reconciled himself with the Church of *Rome*, who in embracing its Religion, wrote in *Rome* it self under the inspection of Pope *Paul V.* and from whose words by consequence there can be nothing concluded touching the Nestorian Church. Secondly, That what he says concerning *our eating the true Body of God, but of God Incarnate; that we drink truly the Blood of a Man, but of a Man that is God*, relates not to our question, nor is not said in this respect, but in regard of the Error of the Nestorians, who will have the Body of *Jesus Christ* to be the Body of a mere man, and not the true Body of *God Incarnate*. What's this to the question, to wit, Whether that which we receive with the mouths of our bodies be the substance it self of the Body of *Jesus Christ*?

*Book 5. Ch. 10.  
p. 500.*

WHAT he alledges touching the Liturgy of the Indian Christians that added to the saying of our Saviour these words, *In veritate*, saying, *Hoc est in veritate corpus, hic est in veritate sanguis meus* is a thing very doubtful. 'Tis not likely *Alexis Menesex* the Arch-bishop of *Goa* who laboured to reduce these Indians to the Faith of the Roman Church would have retrenched from their Liturgy these words *in veritate*, had he in truth found them in it. Those that wrote the actions of this Arch-bishop, say, this addition was made by a Bishop that came from *Babylon*. Mr. *Arnaud* tells us we must not much heed what they relate. This is a mere Chaos wherein a man can comprehend nothing. The Deacon, says he, sings still in their Mass, *Fratres mei suscipite corpus ipsius filii Dei dicit Ecclesia*. But what consequence can be drawn from these words. 'Tis certain that this *corpus ipsius filii Dei*, is a clause added by *Menesex* against the Error of the Nestorians, who would have it to be no more than the Body of a mere man; for every one knows this was the Heresie of the Nestorians. There remains still

still in this Liturgy (as correct as 'tis) several passages that do not well agree with the Doctrine of the Roman Church, as what the Priest says, *Jesus* Missæ Christi. apud Indos Bibl. patr. tom. 6. *Christ our Lord the Son of God that was offer'd for our salvation, and who commanded us to Sacrifice in remembrance of his Passion, Death, Burial, and Resurrection, receive this Sacrifice from our hands.* Were the Sacrifice Jesus Christ in his proper substance, there's no likelihood they would offer it to Jesus Christ himself. Having read the passage of S. Paul, *That whilst we are in this Body we are absent from the Lord, that we desire to be out of the body, to have his presence, that we desire to please him whether present or absent,* &c. rehearsed the Creed, the Priest says, *This Sacrifice is in remembrance of the Passion, Death, Burial, and Resurrection of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.* Then praying for the Consecration, *O Lord God, says he, look not upon the multitude of my sins, and be not angry with us for the number of our Crimes, but by thy ineffable Grace Consecrate this Sacrifice, AND INDUE IT WITH THAT VIRTUE AND EFFICACY THAT IT MAY ABOLISH THE MULTITUDE OF OUR SINS, to the end that when thou shalt at last appear in that humane form which thou hast been pleased to take on thee, we may find acceptance with thee.* On one hand he restrains the Consecration to the virtue or efficacy which God gives to the Sacrament for the abolishing of our sins; and on the other formally distinguishes the Sacrament from the Humane Nature of Jesus Christ, in which he will appear at the last day. Immediately after he calls the gifts, *the Holy Sacraments of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ.* And then beseeches God, *they may be made worthy to obtain the remission of their sins by means of the Holy Body which they shall receive by Faith.* Again, he says, *That he Sacrifices the Mystery of the Passion, Death, Burial and Resurrection of Jesus Christ;* and prays to God, *That his Holy Spirit may come down, and rest on this Oblation, and sanctify it, to the end it may procure them the remission of their sins.* He says not to the end it may change the substance of it, and convert it into that of the Body of Jesus Christ, which yet must have been said, or something equivalent thereunto, were this the formal effect of the Consecration. Having recited our Lords words, *This is my Body, this is my Blood,* he adds, *This shall be a pledge to us to the end of the world.* And a little further, *Esay touched a live coal, his lips were not burnt with it, but his iniquity pardon'd. Mortal men receive a fire IN THE BREAD IT self; and this fire preserves their bodies, and consumes only their sins.* 'Tis easie to perceive that by this fire which is in the Bread it self, he means the Holy Spirit which he had already prayed for to come down and rest on the Oblation. Explaining afterwards what this Mystery is, *Approach we all of us,* says he, *with fear and respect to the Mystery of the precious Body and Blood of our Saviour, and with a pure heart, and a true Faith call we to remembrance his Passion and Resurrection; and let us clearly comprehend them. For, for our sakes the only Son of God has assumed a mortal Body, a spiritual reasonable and immortal Soul, and by his holy Law has reduced us from error to the knowledge of the truth, and at the end of his Oeconomy, offered on the Cross the first fruits of our nature, he is risen from the Dead, ascended up into Heaven, and has left us his Holy Sacraments as pledges to put us in mind of all the favours which he has bestowed on us.* Was not here a fitting place to make some mention of his corporeal Presence in the Eucharist; and having said that he is ascended up into Heaven, does it not seem, that instead of adding, he has left us his Holy Sacraments, he should have said, he yet presents himself on the Altars, in the substance of his Body. Let Mr. Arnaud himself judg whether this Liturgy favours him.



A S to the ancient Liturgy of *France*, which bears that Jesus Christ gives us his proper Body, I have already answer'd that these terms of *proper Body*, signifie only his Body; and I apply the same answer to the passages which Mr. Arnaud alledges of S. *Ireneus*, *Juvencus*, *Gaudencius*, and of S. *Chrysostom*, who likewise use the same term of proper *ἰδίον σῶμα proprium corpus*, signifies *suum corpus*, his Body, not that of another, but his own; for this is often the sense of this term, as we have already shew'd.

S. *Hilary* says, *There's no reason to doubt of the truth of the Flesh, and Blood of our Lord*. I acknowledg he speaks of this Flesh inasmuch as 'tis communicated to us in the Sacrament; but I say also he means the spiritual Communication which Jesus Christ hath given us in the act it self of the Sacramental Communion: and that *Hilary's* sense is, we must not doubt but this Flesh is really communicated to us, inasmuch as our Souls are made really partakers of it.

*EPHRAM* of *Edeffe* speaks likewise of the Spiritual Communion which we have with Jesus Christ God and Man, when he says, *that we eat the Lamb himself entire*.

WE may return the same answer to the passages of *Gelazius* of *Cizique*, *Hesychius*, and the History of the Martyrdom of S. *Andrew*.

*GELAZIUS* of *Cizique* says very well, *That we truly receive the precious Body and the precious Blood of Jesus Christ*; not only because the Spiritual Communion is a real reception of this Body and Blood, but likewise because this Communion consider'd in opposition to the Sacramental Communion, is the only true one.

*HESTCHIUS* says, *That the Mysteries are the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, secundum veritatem, according to truth*, because that in effect the mystical object represented, and communicated to our Souls, in this holy action is the Body and Blood of our Lord; and this is what he understands by the *truth* or *virtue* of the Mystery, as we have already observed elsewhere.

See *Eccl.* and  
*Beatus*, who  
relate this  
passage, *Bibl.*  
*patr. tom. 4.*

The Author of the relation of the Martyrdom of S. *Andrew*, makes this Saint say, not what Mr. Arnaud imputes to him, *That he Sacrific'd every day to God the immaculate Lamb*, but, *that he Sacrificed every day to God ON THE ALTAR OF THE CROSS, the Immaculate Lamb*. Where I pray is Mr. Arnaud's fidelity thus to eclipse these words, *on the Altar of the Cross*, to make the world believe this Author means the Sacrifice which is offered every day in the Eucharist; whereas he means only that every day he Immolates Jesus Christ on the Cross, to wit, in meditating on this Cross, and preaching it to the people. He adds, *That all the people who are Believers eat the Flesh of this Lamb, and drink his Blood, and yet the Lamb which was sacrific'd remains whole and alive; and altho he be truly sacrific'd, and his Flesh truly eaten and drank, yet he remains whole and alive*. This is an allusion to the ancient Lamb of the Jews, which was first sacrific'd, and afterwards eaten by the people, which was a figure of our Saviour, the true Lamb of God that was sacrific'd on the Cross; and whose Flesh was eaten, and Blood spiritually drank by those that believe in him

him by Faith. The Lamb being divided, and not rising again after he was slain, our Saviour Christ has this advantage over him that he is alive after his being sacrific'd and eaten, without suffering any division. But whether we consider this manducation absolutely in it self, or by comparing it to that of the ancient Lamb, it is true. For on one hand it is neither false nor illusory, and on the other it is the truth figured by the manducation of the Lamb of the Jews.

THE passage of S. Leo, which says, *We must in such a manner draw near to the Divine Table, as not to doubt, in anywise, of the truth of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ*, is very impertinently alledged. Mr. Arnaud is not to learn that Leo discourses against the Eutychiens, who denied our Saviour had a real Body; and his sense to be, that when we partake in the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of our Lord, we must not doubt but our Saviour has in himself, in his proper person, a real Body and Blood, and is real man.

'TIS now plainly seen, that this heap of passages which Mr. Arnaud has pretended to make of the consent of all Nations and Ages, is but a meer illusion, and that his design in wand'ring thus from his subject, was only to colour over the weakness of his proofs touching the 7th. and 8th. Centuries now in debate. He had so little to say concerning these Centuries, that he thought it necessary to take the field, and circuit about to amuse his Readers, and fill up his Chapters. But his subject matter is so little favourable to him on what side soever he turns himself, and howsoever he uses it, that we may well say he loses both his time and his pains.

WOULD we really know what has been the sentiment of the ancients, the way to be informed, is not to take passages in a counter sense, and captiously heapt up one upon another: but to apply our selves to the testimony of the Ancients themselves, produced sincerely, and faithfully, some of which are these.

TERTULLIAN. *Those of Capernaum having found our Saviours* Tertull. de res-  
discourse hard and insupportable, as if he design'd to give them TRULT his <sup>ser. car. c. 37.</sup>  
Flesh to eat. To manifest to 'em the means he uses for the procuring us salva-  
tion were spiritual, he tells them, 'tis the Spirit that quickens.

ORIGEN. *There is in the New Testament, a letter which kills him that* Origen. hom. 7.  
does not understand spiritually the meaning of it: For if we take these words <sup>in Levit.</sup>  
in a literal sense, if you eat not my Flesh, and drink not my Blood, THIS  
LETTER KILLS.

S. ATHANASIUS. *The words of our Saviour Christ were not car-* Athanas. in il-  
nal, but spiritual. For to how few persons would his Body have been sufficient, <sup>lad si quis di-</sup>  
and how could he be the food of the whole world? Therefore he mentions his <sup>xarit, &c.</sup>  
Ascension into Heaven, to take them off from all carnal thoughts, and to shew  
them he gave his Flesh as meat from above, heavenly food, a spiritual nou-  
rishment.

EUSEBIUS of Cesarea. *Our Saviour taught his Disciples that they* Euseb. lib. 9. de  
must understand SPIRITUALLY what he told them concerning his Flesh <sup>Theol. Eccles.</sup>  
and Blood. Think not, says he to 'em, that I speak of this Flesh which I now <sup>cap. 12.</sup>  
have

M m m

have on, as if ye were to eat it, nor imagin that I enjoyn you to drink this sensible and corporeal Blood, know that the words I speak to you are spirit and life.

Author. oper.  
imperf. in Mat.  
hom. 11.

THE Author of an imperfect Book on S. Matthew, under the name of S. Chrysostom, If it be a dangerous thing to transfer to common uses the sacred Vessels wherein THE TRUE BODY OF JESUS CHRIST is not contained, but the MYSTERY of his Body, how much more the vessels of our body, which God has prepared as an habitation for himself?

Ambros. lib. 1.  
de officiis. c. 48.

S. AMBROSE. The shadow was in the Law, the IMAGE is in the Gospel, THE TRUTH IS IN HEAVEN. The Jews offer'd anciently a Lamb, an Heifer; now Jesus Christ is offer'd, he is offer'd as a man, as capable of suffering, and he offers himself as a Priest. HERE IS THIS DONE IN A FIGURE; but at the Fathers right hand where he intercedes for us as our advocate, THIS IS PERFORMED IN TRUTH.

Aug. contr.  
Faust. lib. 20.  
cap. 21.

S. AUSTIN. Before the coming of Christ, the Flesh of this Sacrifice was promised by Victims of Resemblance. In the Passion of Jesus Christ this Flesh was given BY THE TRUTH IT SELF. After his Ascension it is celebrated BY A SACRAMENT OF COMMEMORATION.

Aug. in Ps. 98.

IN another place, You shall not eat THIS BODY WHICH YOU SEE, nor drink this Blood which those that are to crucifie me will shed. I have recommended to you A SACRAMENT, if ye receive it spiritually it will quicken you.

Aug. Serm. 2.  
de ver. Apost.

AGAIN elsewhere, The Body and Blood will be the life of every one of us if we eat and drink SPIRITUALLY IN THE TRUTH IT SELF that which we take VISIBLY IN THE SACRAMENT, si quod in Sacramento visibiliter sumitur, in ipsa veritate spiritualiter manducetur, Spiritualiter bibatur.

Hieronym. Com.  
in Psal. 147.

THE Author of the Commentary on the Psalms attributed to S. Jerom. Altho what Jesus Christ says, (He that eateth not my Flesh nor drinks my Blood) may be understood in reference to the Mystery, yet the word of the Scriptures, the Divine Doctrine IS MORE TRULY the Body of Jesus Christ.

Facundus def.  
trium capit. l. 9.

FACUNDUS. The Bread is not PROPERLY the Body of Jesus Christ, nor the Cup his Blood; but they are so called because they contain the mystery of them.

Raban in peni-  
tent.

RABAN. Of late some (that HAVE NOT A RIGHT SENTIMENT) have said of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of our Lord, that 'TIS THE BODY it self and Blood of our Saviour born of the Virgin Mary.

Secumen. in  
1 Pet. cap. 2.

SECUMENIUS. The servants of the Christians had heard their Masters say that the Divine Communion was the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, and they imagin'd that 'twas INDEED flesh and blood.



## C H A P. IX.

*That the Fathers of the Seventh and Eighth Centuries held not Transubstantiation, nor the Substantial Presence.*

WE may judg by these passages which I now alledged, as from a sampler, what has been the Doctrine of the ancient Church in General. That of the 7th. and 8th. Centuries in particular will soon discover it self upon the least observation.

WE shall not find therein either substantial Presence, or conversion of substance, nor existence of a Body in several places at once, nor accidents without a subject, nor presence of a Body after the manner of a Spirit, nor concomitancy, nor adoration of the Eucharist, nor any of those things by which we may comprehend that the Church in those times believed what the Roman Church believes in these.

WE shall find, on the contrary, as I have already observed, that the Authors of those Ages commonly called the Eucharist, *The mystery of the Body of Jesus Christ, the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, the figure of Christ's Body*, which Bede calls *the image of his Oblation which the Church celebrates in remembrance of his Passion*. Who in another place assures us, *That the Lord gave and recommended to his Disciples, the figure of his Body and Blood*. And Charlemain to the same effect, *That he broke the Bread, and delivered the Cup, as a figure of his Body and Blood*.

*Greg. Mag. Isidorus. Bede Haymo & alii passim. Bede in Ep. ad Hüb. c. 7. Idem in Ps. 3. & in quest. in 2 Reg. cap. 3. & in Marc. 14. Carol. Mag. ad alcuin. de Septuagint. Isidor. in alleg. Vet. Test. Idem Orig. lib. 7. Idem Comment. in Genes. cap. 12. Idem Comment. in Genes. c. 23.*

WE shall therein find that this Sacrament, or figure, is Bread and Wine properly so called, without any equivocation. *The Sacrament*, says Isidor, *of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, that is to say, the Oblation of Bread and Wine which is offered throughout the whole world*. Elsewhere, Melchisedeck made a difference between the Sacraments of the Law and the Gospel; inasmuch as he offered in Sacrifice the Oblation of Bread and Wine. Again in another place, *Jesus Christ is a Priest according to the order of Melchisedeck, by reason of the Sacrament which he has enjoyed Christians to celebrate; to wit, the Oblation of Bread and Wine: that is to say the Sacrament of his Body and Blood*. The multitude of Corn and Wine, says he in another place, *is the multitude which Jesus Christ gathered to the Sacrament of his Body and Blood*.

B E D E explaining how the Church has every day our Saviour with her, says, *'Tis because she has the Mysteries of his Flesh and Blood in the Wine and Bread: elsewhere applying to the Church what Solomon says of the virtuous woman, that she eats not her bread in idleness. She eats not, says he, her bread in idleness, because receiving the Sacrifice of our Lords Body, she carefully imitates in her actions what she celebrates in his Ministry; taking care lest she eat our Lords Bread, and drink of his Cup unworthily*. The ancients, says he moreover, *celebrated our Lords Passion, by which, both they and we have been redeemed by the blood and flesh of Sacrifices; and we celebrate it by an Oblation of Bread and Wine*. Elsewhere he assures us, *That our Saviour has established under the New Testament the same kind of Sacri-*

*Bede Expos. alleg. in Sam. c. 9. Idem Expos. alleg. in Prov. lib. 3. c. 31. Idem de Tabern. lib. 2. c. 2. Idem Hom. 12. in Vigil. S. Jo. Bapt.*

Idem hom. de  
sanctis in Epi-  
phan.

Idem Comm. in  
Psalm. 33.

Idem Comm. in  
Luc. 22.

sice, idem sacrificii genus; as that of Melchisedeck, to be the Mystery of his Body and Blood. In his Homily on the Epiphany, he says, that our Saviour having abolished the Paschal Lamb, has changed the Mystery of his Passion into the creatures of Bread and Wine. In his Commentary on the 33d. Psalm he applies what is said of David, that he changed his countenance, and he expresses himself in this sort, He changed his countenance before the Jews, because he converted the Sacrifices of the Law, which were according to the Order of Aaron, into the Sacrifice of Bread and Wine, according to the Order of Melchisedeck. In the same place he says, That our Saviour carried himself (in some sort) in his own hands, at his last Supper, when he gave to his Disciples the Bread, which he blessed, and which his mouth recommended to them. In his Commentary on S. Luke, explaining the words of our Saviour, This is my Body, this my Blood. Instead of the flesh and blood of the Lamb, says he, he has substituted the Sacrament of his Flesh and Blood, IN THE FIGURE OF BREAD AND WINE. And to shew wherein consists this mystical figuration, he adds, That our Saviour did himself break the Bread, to signify the fraction he was voluntarily to make of his own Body. And a little further, The Bread strengthens the Flesh, and the Wine creates Blood in our Bodies; and therefore the Bread mystically alludes to the Body, and the Wine to the Blood.

Book 8. Ch. 4.  
P. 755.

WE find in truth, says Mr. Arnaud, the language of sense in the Authors of these Ages, as well as in those of the following. They could not exempt themselves from using it, whatsoever their opinion was otherwise. But to judg of that which they had in effect, we must consider what they tell us of the Eucharist, when they explain to us what they believe of its nature and essence, when they do not design it, but teach what it is, when they do not only denote to us the matter which God has chosen, but tell us what God does in this matter, when they do not speak of it according to the impressions of sense, but according to the sentiments of Faith.

To make in the sense of the Authors in question a solid opposition between the language of sense, and that of Faith, it ought to be made appear, that according to them, these two languages jumble one another; that they cannot be both of 'em true in the main, and that that of sense is deceitful and illusory, if taken according to the letter. But this is that which Mr. Arnaud does not demonstrate. We know our senses tell us, that 'tis bread, we know their deposition is literal, for 'tis literally and without a figure that our senses tell us that the Eucharist is Bread and Wine. As often then as we find the Fathers of the 7th. and 8th. Centuries speaking according to sense, reason will guide us to the understanding of their language according to the letter, unless we are shew'd that according to these same Fathers, our Faith must correct this language; that she declares it to be false, being taken according to the letter, and does not allow of it unless under the favour of an interpretation and a figure. Were this shew'd us, I confess then we ought to lay aside this language of sense, as being very improper for the discovering to us the true opinion of Authors. But till then, we have liberty to take it according to the purport of the senses themselves, which is to declare to us that the Eucharist is real Bread and Wine. For unless it be shew'd us that those who have used it, had an intention contrary to that of their senses, we ought to suppose they have had even no other than that, for we must ever suppose in favour of nature and the general rule. That if afterwards there be met with in the expressions of Faith something that seems con-

contrary to those of sense, 'tis more reasonable to attribute a figure to the language of Faith which can well bear it, than to that of sense which naturally cannot suffer it. So that comparing these two kinds of expressions, *Bread, and Wine, Body and Blood of Jesus Christ*, one with the other, we must ever take the first in a literal sense, and the second in a figurative one, unless as I said, we are shew'd the contrary by some express declaration.

TO make likewise an exact opposition, between the matter of the Eucharist, and its essence or nature, it must first be shew'd that this matter does no longer subsist, but ceases to be in the very moment wherein the Eucharist is made. For if it subsists, it makes one part of the essence, or nature of the Sacrament; to wit, the material part, and we shall always have right to use for our advantage the passages which call the Sacrament *Bread and Wine*, altho they design the matter of it, seeing this matter subsists. Now of these two suppositions, either that the matter subsists, or does not subsist, that which affirms it subsists, is natural, in favour of which by consequence we must always prejudicate, till such time as the contrary is established by good proofs. I say, that the supposition that the matter subsists is the natural one. First, Because that in all the changes which happen in the world, there is ever a common subject which subsists, it being never heard of that there was ever made a change of one thing into another, where the whole substance of this first thing has absolutely ceased to be. Philosophy can give us no instance of this, and even miracles wrought by the Almighty Power of God furnish us not with any. Secondly, All the changes wrought by Grace leave the matter still subsisting. There's made according to the Scriptures and Fathers, a new Heaven, and a new Earth, a new Creature, and a new Man. A Temple is made of a House; an ordinary Man is made a Bishop, a Stone an Altar, Wood or Metal a Cross, Water, and common Oyl Sacraments, without the matters ceasing to be.

IT subsists on the contrary in all these instances. If then we may not draw advantage from the expressions of the Fathers which call the Eucharist *Bread and Wine*, under pretence they design thereby the matter of it, we must be shewed that according to these Fathers themselves this matter subsists not after the Consecration; for otherwise we shall still naturally suppose that the Fathers delivering themselves with an honest plainness, and far from the prospect of our Controversie have regarded this matter as subsisting.

BUT supposing what I now said signifies nothing, 'tis certain the passages which I produced which design the matter of the Sacrament, do of themselves establish the subsistence of it, for they all consider it after the Consecration, and speak of it as being still the same as it was before, to wit, Bread and Wine. They say that 'tis an *Oblation of Bread and Wine, an Oblation of the same kind as that of Melchisedeck, Bread and Wine, which are the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, Bread which the Church eats, Bread with which is celebrated our Lords Passion, as the Ancients Celebrated it by the flesh of Victims, Bread that came in the room of the Paschal Lamb to be the mystery of Christ's Passion, Bread which has succeeded Aarons Sacrifices, Bread which our Lord held in his hands after he had blessed it, and by means of which he did in some sort carry himself; to wit, inasmuch as he held in his hands his own Sacrament.* Mr. Arnaud's Remark.



mark might take place, did they only say that *the Body of Jesus Christ is made of Bread*, or that *the Bread becomes, and is made this Body*; for then one might dispute whether the Bread be made this Body, either in ceasing to be Bread; or in remaining so. But speaking in the manner I now mention'd, calling it Bread after the Consecration, according to the language of sense, which naturally admits not a figure, and without correcting or explaining themselves, is a sufficient evidence they meant 'twas real Bread in substance.

Y E T let us see what they say of the Eucharist, when according to Mr. Arnaud they design not the matter, but expound the nature and essence of it. Besides what I already said, that they commonly call it *the Mystery of the Body of Jesus Christ, the Sacrament of this Body, the Figure of this Body, the Image of his Sacrifice, the Sacrament of his Incarnation, the Sacrament of his Humanity, the Mystery of his Humanity, the Mystery of his Humiliation*. Besides this I say, 'tis certain they often explain themselves in such a manner that they establish a formal distinction between the Sacrament, and Jesus Christ himself represented by it, and leave it to be plainly concluded they held not this substantial Presence which the Church of Rome teaches.

Gregor. Mag.  
Dialog. lib. 4.  
cap. 58.

IT is in this sense that Gregory the first Bishop of Rome, who lived towards the end of the 6th. Century, and about the beginning of the 7th. wrote, *That this Mystery reiterates the Death of Christ, and altho since his Resurrection he dies no more, Death having no more dominion over him, yet being IN HIMSELF alive, immortal, and incorruptible, he is still Sacrificed for us in the MYSTERY of the Sacred Oblation*.

ISIDOR recites a prayer inserted in the Liturgy of his time, which describes of God, *That the OBLATION being sanctified, may be made CONFORMABLE to the Body and Blood of Christ*. Brevil's Edition has these words, *Ut oblatio quæ Domino offertur sanctificata per spiritum sanctum corpori Christi & sanguini confirmetur*; but this has no sense: and 'tis evident we must read *conformetur*, as Cassander rightly observes, who thus recites it, *Ut oblatio quæ Domino offertur sanctificata per spiritum sanctum corpori Christi & sanguini conformetur*.

NOW howsoever we understand this conformity, 'tis certain it supposes a formal distinction between the Body and Blood of Christ, and the Oblation of the Eucharist; whence it appears, that the sense of the then Church was, not to desire of God that the substance of Bread might become the proper substance of the Body; for this would be, not a conformity, but an intire and perfect identity.

Beda Comm. in  
Psalm. 21.

IT is in the same sense that Bede expounding these words of the 21th. Psalm, *The poor shall eat and be satisfied*, makes a difference between the Bread and Wine of the Sacrament, and the true Body or Blood of Christ; for he introduces our Saviour Christ speaking thus, *The poor, that is to say, those who despise the world shall eat of my Vows. They shall really eat of them, in reference to the SACRAMENT; and shall be eternally satisfied: for by this BREAD AND WINE which are visibly offer'd to 'em, they will understand ANOTHER INVISIBLE THING, to wit the TRUE BODY AND BLOOD of our Lord, which are really meat and drink, not such*

such as fill the belly, but which nourishes the mind. And in his allegorical expressions on *Esdras*, speaking of the Passover which the Israelites celebrated after their return from the Babylonish Captivity, *The immolation*, says he, of this Passover represents the glory of our Resurrection, when we shall eat altogether the Flesh of the immaculate Lamb; I mean of him who is our God and our Lord, no more IN A SACRAMENT, as Believers; but IN THE THING IT SELF AND IN THE TRUTH, as Spectators.

SHOULD we proceed further, we shall find, that these same Authors acknowledge but one true manducation of the Body of Jesus Christ; to wit, that which is particular to the Faithful, and which necessarily and only communicates Life and Salvation: whence it follows they knew not of this oral manducation of the substance of this Body, which is common as well to the wicked as the good, and will not be necessarily attended with Salvation. It is on this ground *Isidor* says, *That the Flesh of Jesus Christ is the food of the Saints, of which if any one eats he shall never die.* And in another place, *It is the Living and Celestial Bread, the food of Angels with which the Word nourishes corruptible men after an incorruptible manner. He was made flesh and dwelt amongst us, to the end men might eat him, and that such as do it may live spiritually.*

*Isidor. in Gen. cap. 1.*

*Idem in Exod. c. 23.*

*Beda in Genes. & Exod. Exposit. in Exod. c. 12.*

WE read the same words in *Bede*, who has without doubt taken 'em from *Isidor*; for 'twas the common custom of the Authors of those days to copy out one from another. He says moreover in another place expressly, *That no Infidel can eat the Flesh of Jesus Christ, and that all those whom he has redeem'd by his Blood must be his slaves circumcised in reference to Vice, and so eat the Flesh of Jesus Christ.* And as *Bede* and *Alcuinus* made a particular profession to be *S. Austin's* Disciples, so they have not scrupled to transcribe into their Books several passages taken word for word out of the Writings of this great man, which confirm the same thing. *Bede* amongst others has taken this out of the Book of *Sentences*, collected by *Prosper*, *He that is not of the same mind as Jesus Christ, neither eats his Flesh, nor drinks his Blood; altho for the condemnation of his presumption he receives every day the Sacrament of so great a thing.* And he and *Alcuinus* have borrow'd from his Treatise on *S. John* these words, *Jesus said to them, this is the work of God that you believe in him whom he has sent.* This is then what is meant by eating the meat which perishes not, but remains to life everlasting. Why prepare ye your teeth and belly, believe, and ye have eaten it: this is the Bread which came down from Heaven, to the end that he which eats of it may not die. This is meant of the virtue of the visible Sacrament. He that eateth internally, not externally, that eateth with the heart, not with the teeth. And a little further, our Saviour explains what 'tis to eat his Body and drink his Blood; *He that eateth my Flesh and drinks my Blood dwelleth in me and I in him. To eat then this meat and drink this drink is to dwell in Jesus Christ, and to have Jesus Christ dwelling in us. So that he that dwells not in Jesus Christ and Jesus Christ in him, does not eat spiritually his Flesh, altho he sensibly bites with the teeth the Sacrament of his Body and Blood; but rather eats and drinks to his condemnation the Sacrament of so great a thing.* And again, *The mark by which a man may know he has eaten and drank, is, that he dwells in Jesus Christ, and has Jesus Christ dwelling in him. We dwell in him when we are the Members of his Body, and he dwells in us when we are his Temple.* And a little lower, *The words which I tell ye are spirit and life. What is the meaning of that, They are*

*Beda in Cor. 11.*

*Beda & Alcu. in Joan. 6.*

are spirit and life? That is, they must be understood spiritually. If ye understand them spiritually, they are spirit and life, if carnally this hinders not but they are spirit and life, but not to you.

IN short, we find these Authors of the 7th. and 8th. Centuries acknowledge no other Presence of Jesus Christ on Earth than that of his Divinity, of his Grace, or Providence, and in no wise that of the substance of his Body. *Isidor. lib. 1. sentent. cap. 14.* Jesus Christ ascending up into Heaven, says *Isidor*, has absented himself as to the flesh, but is ever present in respect of his Majesty, according to what he has said, I am with you to the end of the world.

*Beda Expos. allegor. ap. lib. 1. cap. 12.* THE passages of *Bede* on this subject, are too many to be mentioned here. I shall only relate some of 'em. *The Lord*, says he, having performed the duties of his Oeconomy, returned into Heaven, where he is ascended in respect of his Body, but visits us every day by his Divine Presence, by which he is always every where, and quietly governs all things. There is his Flesh, which he has assumed, and glorified for our sakes. Because he is God and man, says he again, he was raised up into Heaven, where he sits (as to his Humanity which he assumed on Earth.) Yet does he remain with the Saints on Earth in his Divinity, by which he fills both Heaven and Earth. Elsewhere he says that the man mention'd in the Parable of the Gospel, who leaving his house went a journey into a far Country, is our Saviour Christ, who after his Resurrection ascended up to his Father, having left (as to his bodily Presence) his Church, altho he never suffered it to want the assistance of his Divine Presence. Interpreting mystically in another place the words concerning *Ann* the Daughter of *Phanuel*, who was a Widow and aged 84. years. *Idem Comm. in Marc. c. 13.* This *Ann*, says he, signifies the Church which is (as it were) a Widow, since the Death of her Lord and Spouse. The years of her widowhood represent the time in which the Church, which is still burthened with this body, is absent from the Lord, expecting every day with the greatest impatience that coming concerning which it is said, We will come to him, and make our abode with him. 'Twas to the same effect that expounding these words of *Job*, I have comforted the heart of the Widow, he says, that this Widow is the Church our Mother, which our Saviour comforts, and that she is called a Widow, because her Spouse has absented himself from her; as to his corporeal Presence, according to what himself tells his Disciples, The poor ye have always with you, but me ye have not always. *Idem in Luc. lib. 1. cap. 2.* *Idem Expos. alleg. in Job. lib. 2. c. 14.*

IN one of his Homilies he acknowledges no other presence of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist than a Presence of Divinity, and Grace. For having exactly denoted how many times the Lord appeared to his Disciples after his Resurrection. *Idem Hom. 88. de temp. feria 6 Paschal.* He designed, says he, to shew by these frequent appearances that he would be spiritually present in all places at the desire of the faithful. He appeared to the women that wept at the Sepulchre, he will be likewise present with us when we grieve at the remembrance of his absence. He appeared (whilst they broke bread) to those who taking him for a stranger gave him entertainment, he will be likewise with us, when we liberally relieve the poor and strangers. He will be likewise with us in the fraction of Bread, when we receive the Sacraments of his Body, (which is the living Bread) with a pure and chaste heart. We find here no mention of any other presence in the Sacrament, but that of the Divinity.

ALCUINUS teaches the same Doctrine, for expounding these words of



of our Saviour, *The poor ye have ever with you, but me not always.* He shews, says he, we must not blame those that communicated to him their good things, whilst he conversed amongst 'em, seeing he was to remain so short a time with the Church bodily. He introduces our Saviour elsewhere thus, saying to his Church, *If I go away in respect of the absence of my Flesh, I will come by the presence of my Divinity, by which I shall be with you to the end of the world.* He retired from them, says he again, as to his manhood: but as God, he did not leave them. For the same Christ who is man, is likewise God. He left them then as to his manhood, but remained with 'em as to his Godhead. He went away in reference to that by which he is but in one place, yet tarried with 'em by his Divinity which is everywhere.

*Alcuin in Joan. lib. 5. cap. 28.*

*Idem in Joan. lib. 6. cap. 34.*

*ibid. cap. 35.*

LET Mr. Arnaud reflect, if he pleases, on these passages, and, on I know not how many others like 'em with which his reading will furnish him, and tell us faithfully (seeing on one hand there's not to be found in Authors of the 7th. and 8th. Centuries, either Transubstantiation, or a presence of substance, or any natural consequences of these Doctrines; and seeing on the other so many things to be met with in them contrary thereunto, as those I now mention'd) whether he believes 'tis likely we shall by the force of his preparations, suppositions, reticencies, and supplements, acquiesce in his Assertion, that the then Church held constantly and universally, as he speaks, the Real Presence and Transubstantiation. 'Tis certain we must offer great violence to our minds, and after all when we have endeavoured to imagin what Mr. Arnaud would have us, we shall never be able to accomplish it. *We must imagin, says he, Christians persuaded that by the words of the Consecration the Bread and Wine were effectually changed into the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ. This Doctrine was known distinctly by all the faithful.* I know not where Mr. Arnaud has found any of these fanciful people, that are able to persuade themselves what they list. As to our parts, we are not such masters of our imaginations; and in an affair of this nature he must pardon us if we tell him that we cannot fancy a thing to be true, when it appears so plainly to us to be false.

*Lib. 8. cap. 2. p. 737.*

BUT lest he should again accuse us as indocible, we'll see what he has to offer us from these Authors of the 7th. and 8th. Centuries, when they expound the nature and essence of the Eucharist. *S. Isidor, says he, calls the Eucharist the Sacrament of Christ's Body, and if we desire to know in what manner 'tis the Sacrament of it, he'll tell us, That the Bread we break is the Body of him who says, I am the living Bread. He further adds, That the Wine is his Blood, and is the same meant by these words, I am the true Vine.* But he should not suppress what he likewise immediately adds, *But the Bread is called the Body of Jesus Christ, because it strengthens the body, and the Wine alludes to the Blood of Christ, because it produces blood in our flesh. These two things are visible, yet being sanctified by the Holy Spirit they become the Sacrament of this Divine Body.* Is this the language of a man that believes a real conversion of substance.

*Lib. 8. cap. 4. p. 755, 756.*

*ibid. lib. 1. de Offic. Ecclesi. cap. 18.*

HE expressly asserts, says moreover M. Arnaud, that *this Body of Christ which we receive in the Eucharist, and of which we are deprived when 'tis taken from us is the Flesh of Christ, concerning which 'tis said, If ye eat not the Flesh of the Son of man, nor drink his Blood, ye have no life in you; and that this is the Body, the truth, the original represented by the shadows and types in the Old Testament.* I answer, that S. Isidor supposes we eat the Flesh of

N n n

Christ

Christ in the Eucharist, which is true. He likewise supposes that if we eat not this Flesh we remain deprived of Salvation, and this is moreover true. From whence he concludes men ought not to abstain long from the use of the Sacrament, because a total neglect of this means which Christ has ordained for the eating of his Flesh and drinking his Blood, will put us in danger of being wholly deprived of them, for without eating and drinking this Flesh and Blood, there is no hope of salvation. This is *Isidor's* sense, whence there can be nothing concluded in favour of the Thesis which Mr. *Arnaud* defends. For we spiritually eat our Lord's Flesh in the due use of the Sacrament; and 'tis this manducation which *S. Isidor* speaks of, as appears from what he there says. *Manifestum est eos vivere qui corpus ejus attingunt.* And as to what he asserts, that this is the Body, the Truth, the Original, represented by the ancient Figures, we grant it; but deny it ought to be hence concluded, that the Sacrament is the Body it self of Jesus Christ in substance. I have sufficiently elsewhere discoursed in what manner the ancient types related to our Sacraments, and those that please to take the pains to read the first Chapter of the third part of my Answer to Father *Nouet*, will find there, if I be not mistaken, enough to satisfy 'em in that particular.

*ibid.*

*B E D E*, adds Mr. *Arnaud*, says, that the creatures of Bread and Wine are changed through an ineffable virtue, into the Sacrament of his Flesh and Blood. This is one of the expressions which arises from the nature of the Sacrament. But what does it signify in this Author? He tells us in these following words. And thus, says he, the Blood of Christ is no more shed, by the hands of Infidels for their ruine, but received into the mouths of the faithful for their salvation. But this is a very weak objection. The sense of *Bede* is, that the Blood of Jesus Christ is received by the mouths of the Faithful, because they receive the Wine which is the Sacrament of it. Which is the meaning of this term. And thus *sicque*, for he shews in what manner the mouths of the Faithful receive the Blood, to wit, inasmuch as they receive the Sacrament of it. *Gregory the Great* said before *Bede* in the same sense, *That we drink the Blood of the Lamb, not only with the mouths of our bodies, but with the mouths of our hearts. Quando sacramentum passionis illius cum ore ad redemptionem sumitur, ad imitationem quoque interna mente cogitatur, When we receive with our mouths the Sacrament of his Passion, and inwardly apply our selves to imitate this great Saviour.*

*Greg. Mag.  
Hom. 22. in  
Evangel.*

I shall elsewhere in its due place examine what Mr. *Arnaud* alledges touching *Amalarius*, *Florus*, *Drutmar*, and some other Authors of the 9th. Century, Contemporaries with *Paschasius*. It only remains for the finishing of the discussion of the 7th. and 8th. to answer some slight Observations which he has made on a passage in the Book of Images, which goes under the name of *Charlemain's*. The Author of this Book will not have the Eucharist be called an Image, but the Mystery or Sacrament of the Body of Jesus Christ. Mr. *Arnaud* pretends that by this Mystery or Sacrament, we must understand the Body it self in substance: his reasons are, First, That 'tis the Body of Jesus Christ which is represented by the types in the Old Testament. Now this Sacrament is according to the Author of the Book in question, that which was represented by these ancient figures. Secondly, That 'tis the Body of Jesus Christ which is the truth opposed to Images. Now according to this Author this Sacrament is not the image of it, but the truth in opposition to the image. Thirdly, That the reason why he will not have it

it to be an image is, that our Saviour did not say, This is the image of my Body, but this is my Body. Fourthly, That 'tis of the Eucharist we must understand what he says, *That our Saviour did not offer for us an image but himself.*

BUT 'tis no hard matter to answer these objections. The Sacrament of the Eucharist may be considered in two respects, either in opposition to the thing it self, of which 'tis the Sacrament, or in conjunction with this same thing. In the first respect, 'tis a sign or a figure of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ. *Charlemain* himself calls it so in one of his Epistles to *Alcuinus*, as we have already seen, and *Bede* gives it several times this title. But in the second respect *Charlemain* denies we ought to give it the name of image or figure, because he would distinguish it from the legal figures which were only bare representations and shadows which did communicate the Body, or reality of that which they represented; whereas our Eucharist communicates the Body and Blood it self of Jesus Christ sacrificed for us on the Cross, and represented by the ancient figures. He would have us call it then the Mystery or Sacrament of this Body, and the reason which he alleges for it is, that 'tis not a bare representation of a thing to come, as were those of the ancient Law, 'tis the Mystery of the Death of Jesus Christ, of a Death I say that was really consummated; and moreover, 'tis not a bare representation of this Death, but a Mystery which communicates it to us. This is the sense of the Author of the Book of Images, from whence it does not follow that the Eucharist is the Body of Jesus Christ in substance, as Mr. *Arnaud* would hence conclude. For, for to consider the Sacrament, in conjunction with the thing of which it is the Sacrament, 'tis not necessary that the thing be locally and substantially therein contained. It is sufficient that it be really and truly communicated therein to us in a mystical and moral manner. Now 'tis certain that this communication is made therein to the Faithful; and altho the manner of it be spiritual and mystical, yet is it real and true. This is sufficient for a man to say as the Author of that Book does, *That the mystery of the Body and Blood of our Lord is called now, not an image, but the truth, not a shadow but a body, not a figure of things to come, but the thing represented by the figures.* Because that in effect we receive therein the body and truth of the legal shadows. For this reason a man may say that this mystery is the truth in opposition to the images of the ancient Testament; because that in effect God gives us actually in it that which the Law contained only in types. This is sufficient whereon to ground this remark, *That our Saviour did not say, this is the image of my Body, but this is my Body that is given for you.* Because that in instituting this Sacrament he never design'd to communicate to us only a prefiguration, but his Body. In fine, this is sufficient for a man to say with reason and good sense, and with respect too to the Eucharist, *That our Saviour did not offer for us an image, but himself in sacrifice;* because that which he offer'd once for us to God his Father on the Cross, he offers, and gives it us in the Eucharist. In a word, Mr. *Arnaud's* perpetual error is, in imagining that our Saviour Christ and his Body and Blood cannot be communicated to us, unless we receive corporeally in our hands and mouths the proper substance of them. I say, this is a mistake exceedingly distant from the Doctrine of the Fathers, who tell us we receive Jesus Christ himself, eat his Body and drink his Blood in the word of the Gospel, in Baptism, as well as in the Eucharist.



## C H A P. X.

*An Examination of the Consequences which Mr. Arnaud draws, from the pretended Consent of all the Christian Churches, in the Doctrines of Transubstantiation, and the Real Presence.*

*Reflections on the 1. 2. 3. and 4. Consequences.*

**W**E may justly lay aside Mr. Arnaud's tenth Book, seeing it consists only of Consequences, which he draws from the consent of all Churches, in the Doctrines of the Real Presence and Transubstantiation, by supposing he has proved this consent since the 7th. Century to this present. For having overthrown as we have done his Principle, we need not much trouble our selves about its consequences. Yet that we may not neglect any thing, I shall make some Reflections on the principal things contained in this Book, and that as briefly as I am able.

*The first Consequence.*

Book 10. ch. 1.

THE first Consequence bears, *That the consent of all Churches in the Faith of the Real Presence, explains and determines the sense of our Saviours words.* To establish this Proposition, he says that the Ministers endeavour to stretch these words, *This is my Body*, to their sense, by an infinite number of metaphysical Arguments, which have only obscure and abstracted principles: That they use long discourses to expound separately each word as the term *this*, the word *is*, and the word *Body*. That by this means that which yields no trouble (when a man follows simply the course of nature and common sense) becomes obscure, and unintelligible. That supposing in like manner a man should philosophise on these words, *Lazarus come forth*, it's no hard matter for a man to entangle himself with 'em; for this *Lazarus* will be neither the Soul nor the Body separately, nor the Soul and Body together, but a mere nothing. Now a mere nothing cannot come out of the Grave. That our Saviour did not speak to be only understood by Philosophers and Metaphysicians, seeing he intended his Religion should be followed by an infinite number of simple people, women and children, persons ignorant of humane learning. That we must then judge of the sense of these words by the general and common impression which all these persons receiv'd without so many reflections. That to find this simple and natural impression we must consult the sense wherein they have been effectually taken for the space of a thousand years, by all Christians in the world which never had any part in our Disputes. That our Saviours intention was rather to express by these words the sense in which they have been effectually taken by all Christians in the world, which was not unknown to him; than that in which they have been understood in these latter days by a few Berengarian & Calvinistical Philosophers. That he has right to suppose as a thing certain, that since the 7th. Century, all Christians throughout the whole earth have held the Doctrine of the Real Presence and Transubstantiation, and that this consent of all people for a thousand years is sufficient to shew what the simple impression is, and consequently the real sense of Christs words. This is the summary of his first Chapter.

*The*

*The first Reflection.*

THE design of this whole discourse tends to cast men into horrible confusions. I grant our Saviour intended not to speak so as to be understood only by Philosophers, but on the contrary, that his Religion should be embraced by infinite numbers of ignorant people, women, and children, and persons incapable of deep reasoning. But if the sense of these words must be sought in the consent of all Churches, these women and children, and ignorant people will be hard put to it to find it. How few persons are there capable of themselves to make this inquisition, for which they must have skill in Languages, read two hundred Volumes, or more, attentively examine 'em, distinguish the times, places and occasions, consider the circumstances of passages and drift of Authors, compare the various interpretations, and do in a word a thousand things necessary to prevent their taking one thing for another? And as for those that shall take this task upon 'em under the guidance of another, how many cheats are they to beware of? How shall they be certain that they shall have no false Authors imposed upon 'em for true ones, forged Writings attributed to Authors, or false Passages, corrupt Translations, and false Explications to give them another sense than the natural one, that they shall not be imposed on by captious Arguings or frivolous Answers, yet well coloured; that they shall not be tired with fruitless discourses to wear out their patience, and attention, and by this means make 'em fall into the Net. All this has been hitherto done, and I do not find such as be guilty of this do amend whatsoever complaints have been made. I grant one may find the true sense of our Saviour's words in the consent of all Churches: But is it not a more short, sure, and easie way to seek it by considering the words themselves, by comparing them with other Sacramental Expressions, by the nature of the Ordinance which our Saviour instituted, by the circumstances that accompanied it, the design he proposed in it, by his ordinary ways of expressing himself, by the other words he added, by the sense wherein, according to all probability his Disciples understood him, by the explanations which *S. Paul* gives of it, and in short by the genius and universal Spirit of the Christian Religion. Whether a man makes this inquisition by himself, or under the direction of another, 'tis certain that the way which we offer is far less troublesome and dangerous, easier and better accommodated to the capacity of the common people, than that of the consent of all Churches. *Mr. Arnaud* supposes this consent from the 7th. Century to this present, because he believes he has proved it. But were this supposition as certain and true in the main, as 'tis false and imaginary, it can reside nowhere but in the imagination of those that have read his Book. And how many are there in the rank of the simple people that never read it? Of those amongst 'em that have read it, how few have been capable to understand and Judge of it? Are they able to discern whether his citations be true or no, whether his Passages be faithfully translated, his Arguments conclusive, his Attestations allowable; and whether he has not concealed several things which ought to be known on this subject, for a man to be thoroughly informed in it? After all, reason requires 'em to suspend their judgments till such time as they have seen my Answer. And supposing my Answer does not satisfy 'em, how know they but that my weakness or ignorance has prejudiced the Cause I defend? In the mean time what will become of the Faith of these simple persons, if they will make it depend on the consent of all Churches, touching the sense of our Saviours words,

words. Mr. *Arnaud* under pretence of searching short ways, throws men into such labyrinths out of which 'tis impossible to get out.

*Second Reflection.*

I grant that the true sense of our Saviours words must be the simple and natural one. We dispute touching this simple and natural sense. Mr. *Arnaud* will needs have it to be that of Transubstantiation, and the Real Presence, we affirm 'tis the Sacramental or figurative one. Supposing we could not on either side find out this simple and natural impression which these words do of themselves make in the minds of men, by reason of our Dispute, and that we must go search it amongst those that be free from these prejudices, it is not reasonable we should stop at those that lived since the 7th. Century till now, to the prejudice of the first six ages. We must on the contrary begin from the six first. *Tradition*, said one, not long since, whose word ought to be regarded, *must begin from the Apostles, and pass on till this present by an uninterrupted succession.* The first [then] that are to be consulted, for the finding this simple impression, must be the Apostles that heard immediately these words from our Lords own mouth. We must search the History of the Gospel to see whether there be any thing that discovers they took 'em in the sense of Transubstantiation, whether they have been surpriz'd by any astonishment, or ravished with admiration, or troubled with some doubt, whether 'tis likely they were imbued with principles on which this sense is established; as that a body should be in several places at once, and accidents subsist without their substance, &c. And whether they were not on the contrary imbued with some maxims very opposite to this sense: as for instance, that to drink Blood was a crime strictly forbidden by *Moses's* Law, that the signs were called after the name of the things which they signifi'd, and whether it appears from any of their words or actions, that they adored the Eucharist. And 'tis here I think we ought to begin, and afterwards come to *S. Paul*, and examine whether in what he has said on this subject, or any others, there be any thing that shews he believed Transubstantiation. We must afterwards discuss age after age, what the Fathers of the six first Centuries have written on it, consult the Commentaries which they have expressly made on these words, and in short endeavour by an attentive meditation throughly to discover their sense. But to lay aside the Apostles, and the first six Centuries, to begin this enquiry after the simple and natural impression which these words have made in mens minds by the 7th. and 8th. following ones. 'Tis as if a man should go out of *Paris* to learn the news of *France*, in the furthestmost parts of that Kingdom. But 'twill be reply'd, these Centuries were not prepossessed by our Disputes: I grant it. But they may have had other prejudices which have disturbed this simple and natural impression which we seek. What likelihood is there of finding it pure, according as we desire it, in *Greece*, since the fancies of *Damascen* have been in vogue, whom the Greeks esteem as another *S. Thomas*, according to Mr. *Arnaud*; but whom Mr. *Arnaud* durst not follow himself no more than we, whether *Damascen* believed the assumption of the Bread, or only the union of it to the Body of Christ in the manner I have proved and explained? How can it be expected to be found pure amongst the Copticks, Armenians, Jacobites, Nestorians, Egyptians, since these people have fallen into ignorance, gross Errors and Superstitions wherein they still remain. A man that is acquainted with the History of the Emissaries sent from the Latins into all these Countries since the 11th.

Century

In the Remarks on the request of M. D' Ambrun, 9th. Remark.



Century till this time without intermission, may not he justly suspect that the Emissaries have troubled the purity of this Impression? Howsoever it cannot be denied but it was more pure in the six first Ages than in the following ones, and consequently that we ought not to begin our inquiries since that time.

*The third Reflection.*

Mr. ARNAUD unjustly accuses the Ministers for embroiling the sense of these words, *This is my Body*: But we may with greater reason charge the Scholasticks and Controvertists of the Roman Church with it, who have made I know not how many glosses, and formed I know not how many opinions on the word *This*. We know what Ambrose Catarin has written of it, *Let the Reader consider*, says he, *the labour and anguish which almost all Writers have undergone, when we demand of 'em the signification of this Pronoun, This; for they write such a multitude of things, and those so contrary to one another, that they are enough to make a man at his wits end that too closely considers 'em.* The Ministers give these words a sense very plain and natural, which neither depends on obscure and abstracted Principles, nor metaphysical notions. If they argue either to establish their sense, or shew that these words can suffer no other, their arguings lie in observations which are clear and intelligible: as for instance, the word *this* cannot signify any thing else but *this Bread*, and that the whole proposition must be taken as if our Saviour had said, *this Bread is my Body*; and to make this proposition intelligible, we must necessarily give it a figurative sense, for one and the same subject cannot be literally both Bread and Body. I grant we must not Philosophise on these words, *Lazarus come forth*. Neither is there ever a one of us that sets himself to Philosophise on 'em; we understand simply by *Lazarus* a person whom our Saviour raised from the dead in the very moment he called him, as God made light at that very instant wherein he said, *Let there be light*. The difficulties which Mr. Arnaud finds in our Saviours expressions are affected difficulties. But those which arise from the sense of Transubstantiation attributed to our Saviour's words are real ones, not by abstracted and metaphysical arguments, but because never man said, *this is such a thing*, to signify that the substance of the thing which he held was imperceptibly changed into the substance of another, humane language will not suffer it.

*Ambros. Cath. v. Tract. de verb. quibus conficitur, &c.*

*The fourth Reflection.*

Mr. ARNAUD in vain opposes the sense of *Philosophers and Doctors* to that of *simple persons, and such as are not capable of any deep reasoning*, to find out the true natural impression which our Saviours words make on the minds of men, without study and reflection. This natural impression since a thousand years to judg thereof only by History is a thing absolutely unknown and undiscernable to us for two reasons; the first, that the simple are not guided by the most natural impression, they are led by that which their Doctors and Philosophers give them, for we know very well that in matters of Religion the people usually believe what their guides teach 'em, and not what their first sense dictates to 'em. The other reason is, that whatsoever we can know of the belief of Churches since a thousand years depends on the Writings which are come to our hands. Now these Books were wrote by Doctors and Philosophers, who may have given us their Speculations,

culations, and those of the same opinion with them, what they have learn'd in the Schools, or what they themselves have imagin'd, rather than the simple and natural impression of people.

*The fifth Reflection.*

'TIS ill reasoning to say that the sense which seems to have prevail'd since the 7th. Century, be it what it will, (for I examine not at present what that is) must necessarily be the true sense of our Saviour, under pretence that he was not ignorant of the manner in which they would take his words, in this Century, and in the following ones. The mysteries of his prescience, and those of his providence touching the errors wherein he suffers men to fall are unknown to us. Neither is it permitted us to pry into them. He has suffered men to understand in the three first Centuries what is said in the Revelations touching his reign of a thousand years, in the sense of a terrestrial Kingdom. He has permitted men in the 4th. and 5th. Centuries to understand commonly these words, *If ye eat not the Flesh of the Son of man, nor drink his Blood, ye will have no life in you*, of the necessity there is of receiving the Eucharist to be saved. The ways of God are beyond our reach, and we must never judg of the true sense of his word, by the opinions which are prevalent amongst men.

*Second Consequence.*

Book 10. Ch. 2. Mr. ARNAUD's second Consequence is, *That the consent of all the Churches in the Doctrine of the Real Presence during the eleven last Ages being proved, determines the sense of the words of the Fathers of the six first Ages.* His Arguments are the same which the Author of the perpetuity already offer'd. That 'Tis against nature, sense, and reason to suppose the same expressions were used for six hundred years space in a certain sense by all the Christian Churches, and that in all the other ensuing Centuries, they have been used in another sense, without any bodies perceiving this equivocation. That 'tis contrary to nature to suppose all the masters of one opinion, and all the Disciples to be of another, and yet still to suppose they followed the sentiments of their Masters.

*The first Reflection.*

THE Author of the Perpetuity will have the state of the Latin Church in the 11th. Century (when the contests of *Berengarius* hapned) to determine that of the whole Church since the Apostles time. Here Mr. Arnaud pretends that the Churches consent since the 7th. Century determines the sense of the Fathers of the six first. We have likewise seen in the 7th. Chapter of his Book that he asserts that to judg rightly of the expressions of the Fathers of the 7th. and 8th. Centuries, we must suppose they constantly and universally believed Transubstantiation and the Real Presence, and that this supposition must determine the sense of their words. What can we think of all these circuits, but that they are illusions, which plainly enough shew that these Gentlemen find but small satisfaction in their inquiries into the first six ages. Were Transubstantiation and the Real Presence apparently taught in them, what occasion would they have of making them enter by machins, and mount up to them from the later Ages. It is then certain that these ways of reasoning, these suppositions and arguments from the bottom

to

to the top, are so far from persuading us what Mr. *Arnaud* desires, that on the contrary they do but more confirm us in our opinion, which is, that these Doctrines were unknown to the ancient Church.

*The second Reflection.*

THIS consonant to reason to imagin, that in the last Ages the question whether the Eucharist be the substance it self of our Saviour's Body, or not, having been agitated with great heat, those who held the affirmative have abused the general expressions of the ancient Fathers, and endeavoured to turn them to their sense. This is a thing that happens every day in the smallest contests, in which every one desires to set off his sentiments and confirm them by passages taken out of the Fathers to shelter himself thereby from the reproach of innovation. It is likewise easie to imagine that those who but slightly apply themselves to the study of Theological Points are soon cheated by false appearances. We see but too many examples of this. It is in short easie to conceive that Disciples may deviate from the Doctrine and sense of their Masters under divers pretences. The Divisions of Christians in points of Religion have almost all of 'em hapned in this manner, the Disciples were not content to keep pace with their Masters but have went beyond 'em, and often overthrown their real sentiments under pretence of explaining and illustrating what they said with less perspicuity. When Scholars are become Masters, they no longer look upon themselves as Scholars, but Doctors, and in this quality 'tis no hard matter to comprehend they may have new notions, which they endeavour to establish on the testimony of those that preceded them; and for this effect take their words in a contrary sense: The people easily receive what their Doctors teach 'em; and as to the Doctors, there needs no great number of them in an ignorant age to introduce a novelty. One single person may sometimes impose on a whole assembly, and engage them into his opinions, which afterwards shall pass for the true Doctrine of the Church.

*The third Consequence.*

Mr. *ARNAUD*'s third proposition is conceived in these terms, *Lib. 10. cap. 3.* That all the several instances of expressions produced by Aubertin to shew that a man may take in a metaphorical sense the passages by which the Catholics establish the Real Presence and Transubstantiation are in no wise alike. To establish this proposition, he says, there are two ways by which we may know whether the expressions which appear at first alike are in effect different. The first is to mark precisely by reasoning the difference of these expressions, and to shew they are not alike. The second is to discern them by opinion, by a simple view of the mind, and by an impression which makes it self felt altho it cannot be expressed. Applying afterwards this remark to his subject, he says, that the expressions of the Fathers touching the Eucharist having been taken in the ten last Centuries in a sense of Transubstantiation and reality, and the others having never been taken but in a metaphorical sense, there must of necessity be a great difference between them seeing they have made such different impressions, and that opinion has so well distinguished them. This is the summary of his third Chapter.



*The first Reflection.*

WE are agreed concerning this manner of discerning the expressions, and the things themselves, by opinion, as well as by an exact remark of the differences which distinguish them. But if Mr. *Arnaud* will make a maxim of this which may serve as a principle to draw thence certain conclusions, he must suppose that this sentiment or opinion can never be corrupted by false prejudices, nor ever be deceived by establishing imaginary differences, where there are no real ones. I grant that in the last Ages the expressions of the Fathers have been taken in a sense of Transubstantiation, whereas never any man understood those which we say are alike but in a metaphorical sense; this is a sign they were regarded in those Ages as different expressions; but it does not follow that they be different in effect, unless it be said that the sentiment of those Centuries is infallible. It is no hard matter to believe that men may judge rightly in respect of one thing, and at the same time fall into error in respect of another whatsoever conformity there may be between them. A man may be sometimes mistaken by confounding, as if they were alike such expressions as are not so, and then again take for different expressions such as be alike. As we never pretended that the men of these later ages are mistaken in all things, so Mr. *Arnaud* must not pretend they are right in every thing.

*The second Reflection.*

THE method which Mr. *Arnaud* proposes for the discerning the different expressions of the Fathers from those which are alike, is deceitful. For if we must for this end rather follow the way of sentiment than that of reason, 'twill be then at least just to consult the sentiment of those Ages wherein the Fathers lived, and that of persons to whom they spake, and not the sentiment of later Ages which might perhaps have been disturb'd by new notions. Let Mr. *Arnaud* then shew us if he pleases that in the first six Ages the expressions of the Fathers touching the Eucharist were taken in a sense of reality and Transubstantiation, and the others which we produce as being alike, in a metaphorical sense, and we will see what use we must make of his Rule. But to seek this difference of impression or sentiment in Ages wherein we believe this Doctrine was changed, will be an apparent deceiving of our selves, seeing 'tis not possible but what he calls the sentiment or impression has been altered by the change of Doctrine.

*The fourth Consequence.*

Book 10, Ch. 4.

THESE three first consequences are attended by a fourth, which is, *That most of the expressions which the Ministers pervert against the Real Presence and Transubstantiation are naturally of kin to this Doctrine. The equity, says Mr. Arnaud, of this Consequence is apparently visible. For why must these terms subsisting, in Authors that lived since the seventh Century, with the persuasion of the Real Presence, be inconsistent with this Doctrine in the six preceding Ages? And why must not nature which has put later Authors upon making use of them without prejudice to their sentiment produce the same effect in the first Ages? And in fine, what difficulty is there in understanding these terms of the Fathers of the first Ages, in a sense that contradicts not the Catholick Doctrine, provided this sense be found authoriz'd by the consent and practice of the ten following Ages.*

Refle-

*Reflection.*

Mr. ARNAUD seeming to forget the distinction which the Author of the Perpetuity made, and which he himself has sometimes used, concerning a *natural language*, and one that is forced, will not I suppose take it ill if I remember him of it, and use it against his pretended Consequence. There is a difference between the expressions which the Fathers use on the subject of the Eucharist, and the same expressions in Authors of later Ages. The last borrowing sometimes the expressions of the Fathers have at the same time declared themselves in favour of Transubstantiation, or the Real Presence; the former have done nothing like this. The first have left their expressions in the full extent of their natural sense without any mistrust of their being abused. The last have commonly restrained and mollified them by violent expositions, and such as are contrary to their natural sense, as well knowing they may be used against themselves. The first have used them indifferently in all occasions, because they contained their real opinion, but the last have used 'em only accidentally as the necessity of their discourse required. The first have likewise used without any difficulty other emphatical expressions which the last dared not use, for, dare they say for example what *Theodoret* and *Gelasius* have said, that the Bread loses not its nature or substance: dared they say what *Facundus* said, that, the Bread is not properly the Body of Jesus Christ, but is so called because it contains the mystery of it? whence it appears that when they use any of the Fathers expressions, 'tis by constraint, because they must endeavour to accommodate, as much as in them lies, their stile to the stile of the Ancients, whereas the Ancients delivered themselves in a natural manner. We must then make another judgment of these expressions when we find them in the Fathers, than when we meet with 'em in Authors of later Ages since Transubstantiation has been established. There they explain the real Belief of the Church, here they are expressions which are endeavoured to be linked with another Belief, which is expounded in another manner. There they must be taken in their natural signification, here in a forced and foreign one.

THE natural sense of these words of *Justin*, *Ireneus*, *Cyril of Jerusalem* and some others, that the Eucharist, is not mere Bread, common Bread, is, that it is in truth Bread, but Bread that is Consecrated. The strained sense of these words is, that 'tis only Bread in appearance, and in respect of its accidents.

THE natural sense of these words which are frequently used by the Fathers, that our Lord called the Bread his Body, that he gave to the Bread the name of his Body, that he honored the Bread with the name of his Body. That our Saviour made an exchange of names, giving to the Bread the name of his Body, and to his Body that of the Bread. Their natural sense is, I say, that the Bread without ceasing to be Bread, has assumed the name of Christ's Body; the forced sense is, that the Bread takes the name of it, because the substance is really changed into the substance of this Body.

THE natural sense of the passages of the Fathers which assert the Bread and Wine are symbols, signs, figures, images of our Lords Body and Blood, is, that by the consecration the Bread and Wine are exalted to the glory of be-

ing the mystical signs of the Body and Blood of Christ, without losing their own nature. The forced sense is either that the Body of Jesus Christ is the sign of it self, or that the accidents, that is to say, the appearances of Bread and Wine, are signs.

IT is the same in respect of other expressions of the Fathers which the modern Doctors have endeavoured to accommodate to their stile, in giving 'em strained senses and forced explanations which were unknown to the Ancients. To take from us the liberty of making use of them, we must first be shew'd that the Fathers themselves have taken them in this extraordinary and distorted sense. Otherwise we shall still have reason to use them according to their natural and ordinary one.

## CHAP. XI.

### *Other Reflections on Mr. Arnaud's Consequences.*

#### *The fifth Consequence.*

**H**ITHERTO we have not found Mr. Arnaud's pretensions very equitable, but we may truly say that that which we are now about examining, and which is contained in his fifth Consequence, is less reasonable than the rest. He proposes it in these terms, *That the Catholicks have right to suppose without any other proofs that the passages of the Fathers are to be understood in the sense wherein they take 'em, and that all the Answers of the Calvinists in which they establish not theirs by evident demonstrations are ridiculous and unreasonable.*

THIS proposition being very surprizing and contrary to the true rules of Disputation which do not allow any other right or liberty than what reason and truth afford; Mr. Arnaud therefore endeavours to confirm it by a long train of big words and censures full of Authority, and with which he has enriched his 5th. and 6th. Chapters. The result of all which amounts only to this, That the Dispute being reduced to the expounding of certain terms which the Catholicks take in one sense, and the Ministers endeavour to turn into another, the Catholicks stopping at the *literal* signification of these expressions, that they take the Body of Jesus Christ, for the Body of Jesus Christ, and the change of the Bread into the Body of Jesus Christ, for the change of the Bread into the Body of Jesus Christ. But that the Ministers hereto apply one of their two general solutions, or famous keys of *virtue* and *figure* so often used by them. That in this contest 'tis evident that the right of the supposition belongs to the Catholicks. The other thing is, that the expressions which the Catholicks alledg for themselves have been taken in the sense wherein they use them this thousand years by all Christians in the world. That these two qualities reduce this sense into such a point of evidence, that nothing but demonstrations can counterpoise them, and hinder our reason from acquiescing in them.



*The first Reflection.*

THE first of these two reasons whereon Mr. *Arnaud* grounds his pretension is invalid, and the second resides only in his own imagination. I say the first is invalid; for if the Doctors of the Roman Church do propose several passages wherein they stop at the literal signification of the terms; as be those which call the Eucharist the Body of Jesus Christ, and some few others that say the Bread is changed: we also on our parts alledge an infinite of others, wherein we likewise stop at the *literal* signification of the terms, such as be all those that call the Eucharist after the Consecration, *Bread and Wine*, and which say that this Bread and Wine are made the signs, the symbols, the figures of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ. So far matters are equal, and the prejudice cannot favour either side.

MOREOVER, who told Mr. *Arnaud*, we must ever prejudicate in favour of the literal signification of terms? We oft prejudicate on the contrary in behalf of the metaphorical signification by considering the matter to which the terms are applied when 'tis likely they are used figuratively; as when in matter of Books we speak of *Plato* and *Aristotle*, or in reference to Images we speak of *S. Stephen* and *S. Christopher*. It is not enough to say the Catholics stop at the literal signification of terms. This is not enough to establish a prejudice, nor for the obtaining a right to suppose without proof; it must be moreover shew'd that the subject or matter in question does not oppose it self against this prejudice. Mr. *Arnaud* must proceed farther, and shew that there's not any thing absolutely that is able to form a contrary prejudice. But Mr. *Arnaud* was unwilling to enter into this discussion, because of its difficulty; and difficulties are not proper for a man to meddle withal that writes in a domineering stile.

THE second reason has less strength than the first. For first 'tis not true that the expressions which those of the Roman Church alledge in their own favour have been taken in the sense wherein they employ 'em for near a thousand years by all the Christians in the world. Mr. *Arnaud* must not be so hasty to make us receive this proposition till he has heard what I have to say. Now that things are cleared up in this respect, every man may judge of 'em, and I hope they will make a just judgment of them. Secondly, there's a great deal of difference betwixt the Fathers of the first six Centuries, and those of the later Ages, who take these expressions we are speaking of in a sense of the Real Presence and Transubstantiation: We find in these last other expressions which clearly manifest their thoughts. They plainly say that the substance of Bread is changed into the substance of Christ's Body, and that this Body is substantially present under the vail of accidents; but we do not find any thing like this in the Fathers. Now this difference overthrows Mr. *Arnauds* prejudice, for had the Fathers meant by their general expressions the same thing which these last do, they would have spoke like them; but this they have not done. 'Tis not then likely they had the same sense; and it will signifie nothing to say that that which has hindred them from doing so was because there was no contest in the Church all that time touching this point; for the Doctrine of Transubstantiation does of it self form, without the help of any contest, the distinct idea of a real conversion of the substance of Bread and Wine into the substance of our Lords Body and Blood. This Doctrine naturally makes a particular and de-

terminate

terminate sense, where the term of substance enters. There's no need of a disputation for this. Whence it follows that had the Fathers thus meant it, they would have explained themselves in the same manner as these last. It does not appear to us they have done it. It is not then reasonable to prejudicate they held this Doctrine.

THE better to acknowledg the unreasonableness of Mr. *Arnaud's* pretensions, who will suppose at any rate; oppose we against him a contrary pretension, which is, that we have right to suppose without any other proof, that the passages of the Fathers which are offered us, must not be understood in a sense of Transubstantiation nor Real Presence; and that if Mr. *Arnaud* will establish the affirmative, he is obliged to do it by evident demonstrations sufficient to vanquish this prejudication. This here is our pretension; it remains only now to be observed how we prove it: and having seen how Mr. *Arnaud* has proved his, it will be easie to compare proof with proof, and judg which of the two propositions is the most just and reasonable.

FIRST, there ought to be remembred here what I said in the 7th. Chapter of this Book touching the 7th. and 8th. Centuries, that we must ever prejudicate in favour of nature and common sense, which regulate the judgments of men, till the contrary does evidently appear. Now the state of nature is, not to believe the Doctrines we speak of, and it must be granted me that common sense does not teach 'em. We have then right to suppose without proof, that the Fathers did not believe them, and consequently that their expressions must not be taken in this sense: And 'tis Mr. *Arnaud's* part to shew so clearly the contrary, that his proof may surmount the prejudication. Which if he does not do, reason obliges us to let the Fathers alone in the state of nature and common sense.

SECONDLY, The matter in debate does of it self form our prejudice. The point in hand is touching a Sacrament, and in Sacramental expressions we commonly give to the signs the names of the things which they represent; as may be verified by numberless instances. We then have right to suppose without any other proof, that those of the Fathers concerning the Eucharist being of this number must be taken in the same sense as the others, till it be shew'd us from the Fathers themselves that they otherwise understood them.

IN the third place, our right is grounded on the nature of the Doctrine it self, about which we dispute. For the substantial conversion makes of it self a particular sense, it answers to a very distinct question, which is, whether the change which happens in the Eucharist be a change of substance or not; it says, that 'tis a change of substance. It is impossible but those that have this Doctrine in their thoughts must conceive it in this determination, that is to say, in applying their conceptions precisely to the substance; and 'tis not likely they have thus conceived it without explaining themselves sometimes in a manner that answers exactly to their opinion. It is then reasonable to suppose without any other proof, that they have not thus conceived it till such time as it shall please Mr. *Arnaud* to convince us of the contrary from their own declarations, not from general expressions, but by expressions which are formal and particular, or such equivalent ones as may prevent a mans being mistaken in them.

MORE.

MOREOVER, It cannot be denied that Transubstantiation of it self is a hard matter to be believed, and that humane nature is naturally averse to the belief of it. What likelihood is there then if the Fathers designed to teach it they should be content with these general expressions which fix not the mind being as they are, capable of several senses? Had they no reason to fear lest humane inclinations would be apt to turn peoples minds on the other side, and carry 'em off from the true sense of their words.

IN fine, we need only consider the greatest part of those expressions themselves which are proposed, to prejudicate according to appearance that they signify nothing less than Transubstantiation or the Real Presence. For they can no sooner have this sense given 'em but they become immediately difficult and perplexed, whereas in taking them otherwise they become easy and intelligible. What can there be for example more perplexing than this usual proposition of the Fathers, *That the Bread and Wine are the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ*, if a man takes it in a sense of Transubstantiation? For what must we conceive by this Bread and Wine? Is it real Bread, and real Wine? They are not the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ. Are they the appearances of Bread and Wine? How can these appearances be this Body and Blood? Is it that which appears to be Bread and yet is not so? But why must not that be Bread which appears to be Bread? Why if it be not Bread is it called Bread? Is it that which was before Bread and Wine? But how is that which was before Bread and Wine now the Body and Blood, seeing there is no common subject of which we can rationally say, that it was before Bread and Wine, but now Body and Blood. After this rate a man knows not on which side to turn himself, whereas if you understand that the Bread and Wine are the Sacrament of Christ's Body, you'll meet with no difficulty; for the Sacraments usually assume the names of the things of which they are Sacraments: and these ways of speaking create no trouble to a mans mind. Now when we contend about two senses, our reason will lead us to prejudicate in favour of that which is the most easy, and less intricate, and make us suppose it without proof, till such time as it evidently appears that the other, (altho more difficult) yet is the truest.

COMPARE now (I pray) our pretension with that of Mr. *Arnaud*, and judge which of the two is the most just and natural. He grounds his on two reasons whose strength and truth we question, and have already overthrown; and I ground mine on Principles which must be granted by both parties, and which are apparently conclusive. For it cannot be denied but we must prejudicate in behalf of nature, of common lights which regulate the judgments of men, the manner of the Sacramental expressions, and the most easy and least perplexed sense. Neither can it be denied that the nature of the Doctrine in question guiding men of it self to explain themselves about it in precise terms, and indeed necessarily obliging them by reason of the natural repugnancies of mens minds, does not entirely favour this prejudication. It is then a thousand times more rational than the other.

Mr. *ARNAUD* grounds his pretension on an advantage which we are in possession of as well as he. For he says he understands the expressions of the Fathers which are alledged, in a literal sense; we say the same in respect of those which we alledge: but I ground mine on particular advantages to which he cannot pretend. Now 'tis far more reasonable to establish a particular right on particular advantages, than to establish it on a common thing.



thing. For from that which is common to both parties, there can arise no particular privilege.

*The third Reflection.*

ALTHO we have this right to suppose without any other proof that the expressions of the Fathers which the Roman Church alledges in her own favour must be taken in a Sacramental sense, and not in a sense of Transubstantiation or Real Presence; yet in the answers we make, we do not absolutely make use of this right. For before we return our answers we establish the real sentiment of the Fathers by authentick passages taken out of their Books, so that our Answers be only an application of that which the Fathers themselves have taught us. Thus has Mr. *Aubertin* used them, and thus have I used them against the Author of the *Perpetuity*. There is then a great deal of injustice in Mr. *Arnaud's* proceeding, when he produces some of my Answers, and offers 'em to be considered dislocated from my proofs; whereas they ought only be considered in their reference to these proofs, from which they draw their light and strength.

Answer to  
the *Perpetuity*.  
part 2, ch. 2.

FOR example, when I answered the passage of S. *Ignatius* taken from *Theodoret's* Collections, which bears, *That Hereticks receive not the Eucharist and the Oblations, because they do not acknowledg the Eucharist to be the Flesh of our Lord that suffered for our sins*, I said that *Ignatius's* sense was, *That our Saviour did not adopt the Bread to be his Body, as if he had no real Body, which was the foolish imagination of those Hereticks; as appears by Tertullian's Disputes against Marcion, but that the Bread is the Sacrament of this true Body, which died and rose again.* This Answer is grounded on the expresse Declarations of the Fathers, which I had already produced, and which shew they meant by the term of *Flesh*, or *Body* of Jesus Christ applied to the Eucharist, not the substance of this *Flesh*, but the Sacrament or Symbol of it, which is in it self Bread. To take this Answer alone separate from the proof which authorises it to declaim afterwards, that I return Answers without grounding them on proofs, is a thing that is neither honest nor ingenuous. Moreover, what I said touching these Hereticks believing our Saviour Christ adopted the Bread for to be his Body, as having no true Body of his own, is grounded on *Tertullian's* attributing this opinion to *Marcion*, who (as every one knows) follow'd in this the ancient Hereticks; and 'tis to no purpose to say, *That those that taught this ridiculous adoption of the Bread received the Eucharist, and that S. Ignatius speaks on the contrary of Hereticks that did not receive it.* For 'tis certain that these ancient Hereticks still retained some use of the Eucharist, celebrating it in their manner, but did not receive it according to the just and true design of its institution, which is to represent and communicate to us the true *Flesh* of Jesus Christ, who suffered death and is risen again, because they denied our Saviour assumed real *Flesh*, affirming he appeared in the world only in a phantasm. If Mr. *Arnaud* will contest hereupon, besides that I can tell him my Answer will be no less good, in the main, when he shall shew that the Hereticks mention'd by *Ignatius* did absolutely reject the Eucharist, I may moreover oppose against him Cardinal *Bellarmin*, who expressly says touching this passage, *That these ancient Hereticks combated not so much the Sacrament of the Eucharist, as the mystery of the Incarnation; for as Ignatius himself insinuates the reason of their denial of the Eucharist to be our Lords Flesh, was, because they disown'd our Lord assumed true Flesh;* Mr. *Arnaud* will

*De Sacram.  
Euchar. l. 1. c. 1.*

will not I hope pretend to understand more of this matter than *Bellarmin.*

THE same thing may be said touching the Answer I return'd to a passage of *Justin*, which says, *That we take not these things as mere Bread and Drink, but that this meat being made the Eucharist, with which our flesh and blood are nourished, by means of the change becomes the Flesh and Blood of Jesus Christ incarnate.* I answer'd not barely what *Mr. Arnaud* makes me answer, *That this food is made the Body of Christ by a Sacramental union to the Body of Christ, but that in effect the Eucharist is not common Bread and Drink, but a great Sacrament of our Lords Body and Blood, which is celebrated in remembrance of his taking on him our nature, it being honored with the name of Body and Blood of Jesus Christ according to the very form of our Lords own expressions.* I at the same time grounded this Answer on *Justin's* very words, and 'tis moreover established on the proofs which I had already alledged touching the sense of the Fathers, when they call the Eucharist the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ. Yet has *Mr. Arnaud* been pleas'd to say, *That my sense is without proof and Authority, contrary to the Letter and Experience, and consequently not worth considering.* And this is *Mr. Arnaud's* way of solving matters.

Answer to the  
Perpetuity,  
p. 2. ch. 2.

Lib. 10. cap. 5.  
p. 34.

HE does the same in reference to the answers I returned to the passages of *Gelasus*, *Cyzique*, and *Cyril of Jerusalem*; for whereas I have backt them with arguments drawn from the passages themselves, and that they have moreover their foundation on the proofs I offer'd in the beginning of my Book. *Mr. Arnaud* recites of 'em what he pleases, and separates that which he relates of 'em from their true Principle. Whosoever shall take the pains to read only what I wrote touching these two passages in the second Chapter of my Answer to the second Treatise, and the second Part, and especially touching that of *Cyril* in the sixth Chapter of the aforesaid second Part, and compare it with all these Discourses which *Mr. Arnaud* here gives us, that is to say in the fifth Chapter of his tenth Book, I am certain, will not like his proceedings, finding so much passion and so little solidity in his Discourses.

#### *The fourth Reflection.*

*Mr. ARNAUD's* passion does yet more discover it self in his sixth Chapter. Wherein he makes a very bad use of his Maxim. He would extend it so far as to hinder us from supposing there is no express declaration of the Doctrines of Transubstantiation and the Real Presence in the Scripture, and that they are not distinctly asserted therein. He says every body knows that the first notion of the Evangelists words concerning the institution of the Eucharist is most favourable to the Catholics; that the evidence of it ever appeared so considerable to Luther, that notwithstanding his great desire to vex the Pope, he could never resist the perspicuity of them. That *Zuinglius* could not immediately find the solution of these words of our Saviour, and needed to be instructed in them by the revelation which a Spirit made to him of them; of whom he himself writes, that he knew not whether he was a black or a white one, which has, says he, all the lineaments of a diabolical Revelation, whatsoever passages out of *Cicero* and *Catullus* are alledged to justify this expression. He adds, *That these words, This is my Body, do far more naturally signify that the Eucharist is effectually the Body of Jesus Christ,*

Book 10. ch. 5.  
pag. 34. Ch. 6.  
pag. 38. 39.

than that 'tis the figure of it; and this the consent of all Nations, who have taken them in this sense, shews us in a convincing manner. He adds to this the sixth Chapter of S. John, wherein there's mention of eating the Flesh and drinking the Blood, and what S. Paul says in the 11th. Chapter of the Epistle to the Corinthians, that those that eat and drink thereof unworthily are guilty of our Lords Body and Blood. Whence he concludes, *That if it be lawful to make suppositions without any proof the right thereof belongs to the Catholicks, that it appertains to them to say their Doctrine is clearly apparent in the Scripture, in the sixth Chapter of S. John's Gospel, in the three Evangelists, and in S. Paul's Epistles. But that equity and reason oblige the Calvinists to be very scrupulous and modest on this point.*

SEEING Mr. Arnaud is so kind to people as to prescribe 'em after what manner they shall present themselves before him, without doubt he expects they will henceforward obey him in this particular. Yet must I tell him, I have reason to suppose without any other proof, that there is not in the Holy Scripture any formal declaration touching the Doctrines of Transubstantiation, and the Real Presence; nor are they distinctly asserted in them. Every body knows in what terms formal declarations must be conceived, and in what manner Doctrines must be clearly and distinctly exprest. If Mr. Arnaud has discovered in the Scripture any particular matter in relation to this subject, let him communicate it to us. But if he knows no more than we have seen hitherto, we shall still have reason to say that the Doctrines in question are not formally declared in them.

IT cannot be denied but these words, *This is my Body* are capable of the sense which we give them. Whether it be the true one or no I will not here dispute; 'tis sufficient the words will bear it, to conclude they are not a formal distinct declaration of Transubstantiation nor the Real Presence, seeing what we call a formal declaration cannot be capable of a sense contrary to that which we pretend it formally establishes. 'Tis to no purpose for Mr. Arnaud to say that Luther found them evident; for besides that he found no evidence in them for Transubstantiation, but only for the Real Presence, with which he was much prepossessed. One may oppose against Luther's prejudice, the judgment which Cardinal Cajetan made of them who has found no evidence in them, neither for the one nor th'other of these Doctrines, but only by adding to 'em the declaration of the Church. Neither I suppose is Mr. Arnaud ignorant that the most able Divines of his own Communion as well ancient as modern do freely acknowledg that Transubstantiation cannot be inferred thence, and that there is nothing which obliges 'em to believe it but the Churches determination.

Cajetan, in 3.  
Thoma quest. 75.  
art. 1. Lugduni  
apud Stephanum  
Atachalem,  
1588.

AS to the words of the 6th. Chapter of S. John, so far are they from being formal declarations touching Transubstantiation and the Real Presence, that a great many of the Doctors in the Roman Church have not stuck to affirm that these words do not at all relate to the Sacrament of the Eucharist. Bellarmine reckons up six besides others, namely, Biel, Cusanus, Cajetan, Tapper, Hesselius, and Jansenius, but Mr. Aubertin has computed 'em to be about thirty three, which is in my mind sufficient to make Mr. Arnaud comprehend, that this Chapter is not so formal, nor evident for these Doctrines as he imagines. I shall not here take notice of what he alledges concerning those words of S. Paul, *That such as eat of this Bread and drink of this Cup unworthily, are guilty of our Lords Body and Blood.* If

Bellarmin, de  
Euch. l. 1. c. 5.  
Albertin de  
Sac. Euch. l. 1.  
c. 30.



If he takes these words for an evident declaration, it is yet more evident that he is mistaken. To be guilty of our Lords Body and Blood signifies according to the Fathers to be a murderer of our Saviour, to be of consent with the Jews, that crucifi'd him. This is not very formal for Transubstantiation.

WHAT he says touching *Zuinglius* is not at all to the purpose, *Zuinglius* was not ignorant of the sense of our Saviours words, but he was ignorant of the examples of like phrases which are in Scripture. Mr. *Arnaud* mentions this only that he might bring in again this black or white Spirit, of which we have already discoursed, not only from passages out of *Cicero* and *Catullus*, but also out of *Apuleus*, and *S. Jerom* himself; so that this must be lookt upon as impertinent and tiresome. Mr. *Arnaud*'s passion herein appears in that *Zuinglius* having only said that some body appear'd to him in a dream to advertise him, *visus est monitor adesse*, he will needs have this *monitor* to be a Spirit. Neither is there less ignorance in raising from a proverbial way of speaking in the Latin tongue, *ater fuerit an albus nihil memini*, which signifies that we know not a man, we never saw his face, this proposition, *That he knew not whether 'twas a white Spirit or a black one.* Cannot Mr. *Arnaud* better spend his time than in hunting after these trifles?

BUT says he, *The first idea of our Saviours words touching the Eucharist is very favourable to the Catholicks.* It is favourable by an effect of prejudice, I grant. But let a man take off this vail from his mind, and represent to himself our Saviour in his natural Body on one side, and the Eucharistical Bread on the other, two visible objects really distinct and locally separate from one another, and judg in this case whether the first idea of these words rather refers to a Transubstantiation of one of these objects into the other, or to a Sacramental sense. The first idea from words does not always arise from the literal signification of them, but from the matter in question, and circumstances of a discourse. And this is that which forms the first idea, as may be justified by infinite instances, should Mr. *Arnaud* question it. Now 'tis certain that in respect of our Saviours words all these things do joyntly concur to give them naturally a mystical or figurative sense.

ALL Nations, says he, *have taken them in this sense.* All Nations, that is to say, the Latins since *Gregory VII.* and *Innocent III.* and yet not all of them neither. This is a supposition which Mr. *Arnaud* will have right to make when he can better prove it. But supposing it were true as he would make the world believe, that since a thousand years all Nations took them in this sense, it will not hence follow that this was the first idea of these words, nor that the Roman Church has right to suppose without any other proof, that her Doctrine is clearly contained in the Scripture. For it is possible for all Nations to fall into an error touching the sense of certain words, be engaged in it through surprisal, and afterwards remain therein by prejudice and interest. And in this case every man sees that this pretended clearness which Mr. *Arnaud* boasts of cannot be justly supposed.

IN fine, supposing 'twere true the first idea of these words was very favourable to the Church of *Rome*, and that all Nations since a thousand years followed this first idea, Mr. *Arnaud* could not hinder me from saying there is not in the Scripture any formal declaration touching Transubstantia-

Answer to the  
second Tre-  
tise of the Per-  
pituity, part 1.  
ch. 3.

tion and the Real Presence. And this he well knew himself. But that he might take his full carier, he imagin'd 'twas his best way in reciting the passage of my Answer, on which he grounds his invective to eclipse these expressions from it, *by some formal declaration of his word*, because 'twould appear that my sense in 'em is that the Doctrines of the conversion and substantial Presence are not taught in exprefs terms in the Holy Scripture, nor are to be drawn thence by necessary consequences, which is most true. *Who will believe*, said I, *if they be of God, that he would leave them as a prey to the contradictions of reason and sense, which he himself has armed against them, without strengthening them with his protection by some formal declaration of his word.* *Who will believe that the Divine Wisdom, &c.* And here observe how Mr. Arnaud cites them, *Who will believe that if they be of God, he would leave them as a prey to the contradictions of reason and sense, which he himself has armed against them, without strengthening them with his protection?* *Who will believe that the Divine Wisdom, &c.* Mr. Arnaud has not only the right of supposing without proof what he pleases, but that of maiming such passages as seems good to him, to alledg that which precedes, and that which follows, and suppress betwixt both, whole clauses, because they take from him all pretence of declaiming. 'Tis by virtue of the same right that he thought he might lay aside that which I added towards the end of this passage. *Say what you will of it, I cannot believe but this silence disquiets you, especially if you consider that there is in the New Testament four different occasions wherein according to all appearances Transubstantiation and the Real Presence were to be found DISTINCTLY ASSERTED.* This distinctly asserted not well relishing with Mr. Arnaud, he has ended his citation in these words, *Say what you will of it, I cannot believe but this silence sufficiently perplexes you.* This privilege of curtailing and suppressing is insupportable in another. But what ought we not to yield to Mr. Arnaud, especially considering how well he has copied out from *Allatius* and *Raynaldus*, and proved that the Greeks believe Transubstantiation? Had he not maim'd and suppress'd that which perplexed him in my Book, I never should have had the pleasure of seeing my self brought into his Chapter by an excellent figure of Rhetorick, speaking in this manner. *All Christians in the world are persuaded that Transubstantiation is contained in the words of the Evangelists, and those of S. Paul. But I Claud declare 'tis not contained in them, and confirm my assertion by my own authority.* This deserves the name of eloquence and ingenuity.

Lib. 10. cap. 6.  
pag. 43.

#### The fifth Reflection.

Mr. ARNAUD is not content to gather for himself alone the fruits of his victories, he is willing to bring in the Sociniens for a share with him, and his conceptions on this subject are remarkable. I brought some proofs drawn from Scripture touching the Trinity to shew in what manner this mystery is asserted in the word of God. *These*, says he, *are only suppositions without proof.* This is certainly absurd enough to call proofs, and such proofs too as are drawn from Scripture suppositions without proof. *They would be*, says he again, *very rational in the mouth of a Catholick, because he accompanies these proofs, with the publick sense of the whole Church and all Tradition; but these same proofs are extremely weak in the mouth of a Calvinist, without authority and possession, and who renounces Tradition and the Churches Authority.* This proposition surprizes me. The proofs of Scripture touching the mystery of the Trinity will be of no validity, but weak proofs

Ch 6 p. 44, 45.

proofs in their own nature without the benefit of Tradition, and all their evidence and strength must depend on the publick sense of the Church; *Hoc magno mercentur Atridae. The Arians and Sociniens are much obliged to Mr. Arnaud.* But this was not S. Austins sentiment, when disputing against Maximus an Arian Bishop, he told him, *I must not alledg to you the Council of Nice, nor you to me that of Ariminis. For as I am not obliged to acquiesce in the authority of this last, so neither are you bound to be guided by the authority of the first. But proceed we on the authority of Holy Scripture which is a common witness for us both, oppose we Cause to Cause, and Reason to Reason.* Should Mr. Arnaud's Principle take place, S. Austin would have been guilty of a great imprudence thus to lay aside the publick sense and Tradition, and wholly betake himself to the Holy Scripture, seeing the proofs taken thence concerning the Trinity, are weak, yea even infinitely weak, separated from Tradition and the Churches Authority. What answer will Mr. Arnaud make a Socinien when he shall say we must not value this publick sense, and Tradition, which is in it self grounded on weak proofs. For after all, why has the publick intelligence taken the passages of Scripture in this sense, if the proofs of this sense are so slight in themselves. 'Tis neither rashly nor enthusiastically, nor without just grounds that Tradition is to be found on this side. But what are the reasons of it, if the proofs drawn from Holy Scripture, to ground this sense on, are in themselves extreme weak? Mr. Arnaud does not consider that he not only gives the Sociniens an unjust advantage, but likewise ruins himself his own Principle, as fast as he thinks he establishes it.

Aug. lib. 3.  
cont. Maxim.  
cap. 14.

HE says, *that I suppose my passages concerning the Trinity are unanswerable.* When a Socinien shall reply thereunto, we shall have enough to shew that his answers are vain, and yet I shall have right to suppose the solidity of my proofs till these pretended replies come. He adds, *That I suppose the Sociniens object not any contrary passage.* Which is what I do not suppose, but I suppose they cannot object any, that can prevail over those I offer'd. I have reason to suppose it without being obliged to discuss either their answers or objections. If Mr. Arnaud's observations must be a rule, why has he contrary thereunto wrote this 10th. Book, which is only grounded on a supposition. He supposes the consent of all Christian Churches in the Doctrines of Transubstantiation and the Real Presence, imagining he has well proved them. But I need only mind him of his own remarks, and tell him he supposes. 1. That his proofs are unanswerable. 2. That we will not offer contrary ones against them, and consequently his supposition is faulty. If he answers it belongs to me to make my replies, and produce my objections, and that till then his supposition holds good, let him take the same answer from me on the subject here in question.

HE says in fine, *That I suppose reason remains neuter, contenting it self without teaching the Trinity, and approving on the contrary certain truths which have a natural coherence with that particular one, that I suppress this infinite crowd of difficulties, wherewith reason furnishes those against this Article, who take this dangerous way whereby to judg of the mysteries of Faith.* A man that so confidently blames suppositions ought not to make such a terrible one as this is, without grounding it at least on some proofs, *That reason furnishes us with an infinite crowd of difficulties against the Article of the Trinity.* The objections made against this mystery proceed either from the weakness or corruption of reason, rather than from reason it self; and I

con-



confess there are of this kind, not a crowd of difficulties as Mr. *Arnaud* exaggerates it, but some; that may perplex a mans mind. So likewise did I never suppose this Article was wholly exempt from 'em; I have on the contrary formally acknowledged them. But to say no more, there needs only be read what I wrote on this subject to find, that Mr. *Arnaud* could not worse disengage himself from this part of my answer, having left it untouched in its full strength. Especially let any one read the places wherein I establish by Scripture the Divinity of the three persons, and especially that of our Lord and Saviour, and judge whether 'tis wisely said, *That I ruin the Soci- niens without redemption, but 'tis by such a way, as will rather make them laugh, than change their minds.* This discourse is not very edifying, and is perhaps capable of a sense which will not be to Mr. *Arnaud's* advantage. But 'tis better to pass on to his sixth Consequence.

*The sixth Consequence.*

*THAT the consent of all the Christian Churches in the Doctrine of the Real Presence and Transubstantiation, helps us to distinguish the necessary consequences of these Doctrines from those which are not so, and by this means shews the falsity of several of the Ministers Arguments.*

*The first Reflection.*

WE grant there is a difference between the necessary consequences of a Doctrine and that which we call the consequences of congruity, which are not of absolute necessity. But to make a good use of this distinction, it must be attended by these following observations. 1. That the arguments drawn from the consequences of congruity, have more or less force, according as the consequences themselves have more or less natural coherence with the Doctrine in question. 2. That when a consequence seems to be natural, and is confirmed moreover by experience, it is not enough for the refuting the Argument drawn thence barely to say that 'tis only a consequence of congruity, which has not an absolute necessity. We must either oppose against it contrary proofs that are stronger, and which cannot be confuted by these sort of Arguments taken from consequences, how natural soever they may appear to be, or oppose against them a contrary experience, or give a reason why these consequences cannot take place, and by this means discover the obstacles which have impeded them. 3. That the Argument becomes very strong when 'tis drawn from a great number of these consequences, it being very unlikely but nature has produced her effect in respect of some of 'em. 4. That when the natural consequences of a Doctrine do not appear at certain times, or in certain places, there must therein at least appear other equivalent ones which are instead of those, it being scarcely possible for nature to remain absolutely without effect.

TO apply now these observations to the Ministers way of arguing, I I say that 'tis a natural consequence of the Doctrine of Transubstantiation to find contradictions in mens minds, and produce Disputes and Controversies amongst them, experience confirms it since the 11th. Century to this present. We may then draw a great proof that the ancient Church held not this Doctrine, in that she remained in peace concerning this subject, till *Paschasius's* time, altho there were otherwise, Controversies touching almost all the Articles of the Creed. 'Tis not sufficient for the relating  
of

of this Argument to answer as Mr. *Arnaud* does, that this is only a consequence of congruity, and that *'tis natural enough for people not to rise up against this Doctrine when the custom of Faith has suppled mens minds into docility towards this mystery.* I will answer him that 'tis not at all natural to suppose this docility in all mens minds for eight hundred years together in relation to this Doctrine of Transubstantiation, that 'tis on the contrary very natural not to suppose it to be in all, and that that which he calls the custom of Faith, does not usually incline mens minds to this docility till after several contradictions and repugnancies, as appears by the example of all the Articles of the Christian Religion which have this difficulty. He must therefore offer against this Argument strong and convincing proofs, by which it may appear that the ancient Church held this Doctrine, or instance in some Doctrines as difficult as Transubstantiation, that were never controverted; or in fine give a reason why this consequence which seems to be such a natural one, yet has had no place during eight hundred years.

**T**IS also a consequence natural enough of Transubstantiation, that 'tis endeavoured to be established by sensible Miracles; for Miracles are one of the chief instruments by which mens minds may be mollified towards this docility of Faith which Mr. *Arnaud* mentions. Experience confirms this since *Paschasius* his time to this present. We may then very well argue in this manner, and conclude that these Miracles appearing only since the 9th. Century, 'tis most probable that was the time wherein Transubstantiation came into the world. And 'tis not sufficient for the confuting of this Argument to say this is not a consequence absolutely necessary; for altho this be true, yet that is a consequence natural enough, being grounded on experience.

**I**T is moreover a consequence natural enough of Transubstantiation, and confirm'd by experience not to expose the proper substance of Christ's Blood to the inconveniencies which attend the custom of communicating of both kinds, and consequently not to admit people indifferently to the participation of the Cup. As we find not this consequence in the first Centuries, and it appearing in the latter, we may make hence a probable conjecture concerning the change that has been introduced in respect of this Doctrine. For 'tis not likely that during so long a time men were not troubled with these inconveniencies which are so ordinary, and resolved at length to remedy them. To say, hereupon, that they communicated of both kinds to imprint more deeply the Death of Christ in the minds of the Communicants by the representation of the separation of the Body and Blood, is as much as amounts to nothing; for the reason of the inconveniencies is far stronger than this other contrary reason: as appears by the example of the Roman Church since the Council of *Constance*.

**A** MAN may likewise strongly argue from the common practices of the Roman Church, by which she shews that she adores the Sacrament with an adoration of *latria*, hereby to declare that the Greek Church does not adore it, seeing she has none of these customs. For altho each of these practices had only a link of simple congruity with the Doctrine of the Adoration, yet is it no ways likely but the Greek Church would practise some of 'em, or at least others equivalent to 'em, that are as significant to testify openly the acts of Adoration. This then is no satisfactory answer, but a mere evasion to say that these are only consequences of congruity.

*The*

*The second Reflection.*

AS fast as we establish the solidity of these Arguments drawn from consequences, it will not be amiss to observe Mr. *Arnaud's* illusion. We make use of these proofs on the question, Whether the ancient Church believed Transubstantiation, to shew she did not believe it; or on the question which respects the Schismatical Churches, to shew that they hold not Transubstantiation neither, nor adore the Sacrament. Mr. *Arnaud* has shunned to touch on these proofs whilst he treated on these questions, he has reserved himself to refute them by way of consequence in his 10th. Book, wherein he supposes the consent of all Nations since the 7th. Century to this present. Whereas we say for instance, That the Greeks do not believe Transubstantiation, because we find not among them the consequences of this Doctrine. Mr. *Arnaud* perverts this order, and says, That our Arguments drawn from these consequences are invalid, because the Greeks who believe Transubstantiation according to the supposition which he makes of 'em admit not these consequences. I confess this circuit is a very dexterous one, but by how much the greater art there is in it, by so much the more plainly does he discover the strength of our Arguments, seeing Mr. *Arnaud* is forced to elude them in this manner.

*The seventh Consequence.*

Chap. 8.

Mr. *ARNAUD's* seventh Consequence is, *That the Doctrine of the Real Presence and Transubstantiation does not of it self lead a man to the discoursing of Philosophical Consequences, nor upon explaining the difficulties of this Mystery; and therefore 'tis no marvel that the Fathers never took notice of 'em.*

*Reflection.*

WE have already refuted this opposition, and it only remains that we observe here again Mr. *Arnaud's* illusion, who to answer the proof drawn from the Consequences which he calls Philosophical ones, such as are the existence of accidents without a subject, the existence of a body in divers places at once, the concomitance, &c. which were unknown to the ancient Church, as well as to the Schismatical Churches, supposes first that these Churches do firmly believe Transubstantiation, and concludes afterwards that our proof must needs be invalid, seeing here are the Greeks, Armenians and Copticks, &c. who make no mention of these difficulties. So that by this means there are no Arguments which Mr. *Arnaud* cannot easily answer.

WE have likewise refuted particularly what he offers touching the adoration of the Eucharist in his 9th. Chapter. And as to what he alledges in the 10th. touching the impossibility of the change which we maintain, we will treat thereof in this following Book.

BOOK



## BOOK VI.

*Concerning the Change which has hapned in the Doctrin of the Latin Church in respect of the Eucharist. That this Change was not impossible, and that it has effectually hapned.*

## CHAP. I.

*The state of the Question touching the distinct knowledg of the Presence, or Real Absence.*

**D**ESIGNING particularly to treat in this 6th. and last Book of the Change which has hapned (according to us) in the Latin Church, I could not better begin it than by the question, Whether men ever had a distinct knowledg of the Presence or Real Absence. This distinct knowledg being one of the principal means which the Author of the *Perpetuity* has made use of to shew that the change which we suppose is impossible, it is necessary then to consider it first. 'Tis likewise for this reason that I reserved the discussion of Mr. *Arnaud's* 6th. Book for this place; for having treated of the Author of the *Perpetuity's* method, I believed 'twas necessary to discuss without interruption whatsoever concerned the Greeks and other Eastern Christians, to examin at the same time the state of the Latins in the 7th. and 8th. Centuries, and afterwards pass on to the Consequences which Mr. *Arnaud* draws from the pretended consent of all Churches in the Doctrines of Transubstantiation. Which done, due order requiring us to proceed to the question of the change which hapned in the 9th. 10th. and 11th. Centuries; and this other Question of the distinct knowledg which Mr. *Arnaud* handles in his 6th. Book, being a dependance of that of the change, or to speak better, a preamble to it, I believed this was the most fitting place to examin it.

BUT before we enter into this matter, it is necessary to state the question clearly, and for this effect I shall propose some remarks which will plainly discover wherein consists the point of our difference. First, I grant Mr. *Arnaud* that the Author of the *Perpetuity* has not offer'd his Argument drawn from the distinct knowledg, but only in respect of the Real Presence, and not in reference to Transubstantiation. But Mr. *Arnaud* likewise must grant that this proof does not fully answer the design which the Author of the *Perpetuity* proposed to himself at the entrance of his Treatise, *To make us confess from the evidence of truth it self, that the Belief of the Roman Church touching the Mystery of the Eucharist is the same with that of all antiquity.* For the Roman Church does not simply stop at the Real Presence,

*Perp. Faith, pag. 14.*

he believes likewise Transubstantiation. Now in this respect that Author's proof concludes nothing. Yet seeing he himself has restrained his Argument only to the Real Presence, it will not be just to give it a greater extent in this respect.

IN the second place it must be granted that the question here concerns not persons that have no knowledge of Christianity, and consequently perhaps never heard of the Eucharist nor Body of Jesus Christ. The point in hand concerns persons that made open profession to be Christians, who Communicated; and knew that our Saviour Christ is in Heaven, so that they had some kind of notion as well of the Eucharist as of the Body of Jesus Christ. So far Mr. Arnaud and I agree well enough.

Refutation,  
Part. 2. Ch. 2.

Lib. 6. cap. 3.

BUT our difference begins from the complaint I make against the Author of the *Perpetuity*, in that he would establish the state of this question in an illusory manner. *It concerns us*, says he, *to know whether the faithful could remain for the space of a thousand years in the Church without forming a distinct and determinate notion, whether what they saw was or was not the true Body of Jesus Christ.* Mr. Arnaud maintains this state of the question, and I affirm 'tis wholly captious, and that the question does not at all concern this matter. Which we shall illustrate by a third remark. I say then the question is properly to know whether during a thousand years the people that were in the Church ever formed a distinct and determinate notion, whether what they saw was or was not the Body of Jesus Christ in proper substance, without ever ceasing during all this time to have this same notion thus distinct and determinate. The Author of the *Perpetuity* and Mr. Arnaud are obliged to prove the affirmative, because in their respect 'tis a necessary proposition which they offer in form of a Principle, without which their Argument touching the impossibility of the change concludes nothing. I must defend the negative, but this negative consists not in affirming that during a thousand years the faithful could remain without forming this distinct and determinate notion here in question, it consists in affirming only that during a certain time comprehended within the extent of these thousand years the people have not formed this distinct notion. These Gentlemen's affirmation must be general for the thousand years, and if there be wanting but one, or less than one Age, their supposition will be ineffectual, seeing 'tis only by this they can prove that the change we dispute about was impossible during these thousand years. But as to my own part, 'tis sufficient I affirm their supposition to be false during a certain time wherein the change will be made. It will do these Gentlemen no harm, perhaps, who scoff at that *Philosophy* which they call School-boys Exercise, to consult it sometimes; for it will teach them to distinguish between a contrary opposition, and a contradictory one. Two contrary propositions may be both of 'em false, and are never very proper to form a just state of a question between rational persons who dispute to find a Verity, and not to discover two falsities. For example these two propositions, *Men are liars. Men are always liars*, are opposite by an opposition called contrary. They are both false and cannot form a just question. To form it there must be made this contradictory opposition. *Men are not always liars, men are sometimes liars*; or, *men are always liars, men are not always liars, they are sometimes true.* That man will justly render himself ridiculous, who having offer'd this proposition, *That during a thousand years men always spake the truth*; and attempting to maintain it, shall afterwards give an exchange, and say the

the question is, *Whether men could remain a thousand years without speaking any truth.* \* He may be well told this is impertinently stated, and that this is not the point in hand, but only to know whether they always said the truth during a thousand years without ceasing ever to speak it; or whether they have been sometimes liars. This instance alone exactly discovers the Author of the *Perpetuity's* illusion, who having offer'd this proposition, *That the faithful ever had a distinct knowledg whether the Eucharist was or was not the Body of Jesus Christ*, that is to say, the proper substance of the Body of Jesus Christ; for 'tis thus he understands it, has afterwards proposed the state of the question in these terms, *It concerns us to know whether the faithful could remain a thousand years in the Church without forming a distinct and determinate notion; whether that which they saw was or was not the true Body of Jesus Christ.* We have just cause to tell him that this is not the point, but whether they always were in a condition to form this distinct notion, or whether sometimes they were not.

Mr. ARNAUD endeavours in vain to excuse the Author of the *Perpetuity*, that he only established this state of the question on the very terms of my answer. For supposing it were true that the terms of my Answer furnished him with an occasion or pretence for this, yet must he not thus establish it to the prejudice of the publick interests which require a man to proceed right on in a Dispute, to find the truth, and not to amuse ones self in deceitful and fruitless contests, and prove things which will signifie nothing. Now this is what the Author of the *Perpetuity* has done, and Mr. Arnaud likewise by means of this false state of the question, as will appear if we consider that when they have proved most strongly and solidly, and in the most convincing manner imaginable, *That the faithful could not remain a thousand years in the Church without forming a distinct and determinate notion, whether that which they saw was, or was not the true Body of Jesus Christ*, which is a proposition contradictorily opposite to that which they express in their state of the question, they will do nothing in order to the clearing up of our difference. We dispute whether the change which the Protestants suppose be possible or not. Now to prove that 'tis impossible by the Argument of the distinct knowledge, it signifies nothing to shew that the faithful could not remain a thousand years in the Church without forming this distinct notion now in question. For they might remain only a hundred years in it, fifty years, thirty years, without forming it; this is sufficient to invalidate their proof, and give way to the change which we pretend. To shew it is impossible that a man has entred into a house, it is not enough to prove that the door of this house could not remain open for ten years together; it must be shew'd that it was always kept shut. For if it has been left open only one day, the proof concludes nothing. It is then evident that these Gentlemen beat the air, and that whatsoever they built on their state of the question, is only an amusement to deceive silly people. Whence it follows that persons of sense may justly complain of them, in that they have made my words, be they what they will, a pretence whereby to entertain the world with fruitless discourses.

BUT moreover 'tis certain that the Author of the *Perpetuity* has perverted my words and sense. 'Tis true that in the fifth Observation of my first Answer I established this general Principle, *That error and truth have equally two degrees, the one of a confused knowledg, and th'other of a distinct one, and that 'tis hard to discover any difference betwixt them, whilst they are*



in this first degree of confused knowledg, unless a man comes to the other, termed a distinct knowledg: that the ideas are so like one another that a man cannot easily discern them. It is true that from this Principle I generally concluded, That before an Error becomes famous by its being opposed, the greatest part of the Church content themselves with holding the truth in this indistinct degree I now mention'd, and so it is easie for a new Error to insinuate and settle it self in mens minds under the title of an illustration of the ancient truth. It is moreover true that in applying this Principle I added these terms. To apply this to the matter which we treat of, I say that before Transubstantiation came into the world, every one believed our Saviour to be present in the Sacrament, and that his Body and Blood are really therein received by the faithful Communicant, and that the Bread and Wine, are the signs and memorials of his Death and Passion on the Cross; this was the Faith of the whole Earth; but I shall not be mistaken when I say, there were few that extended their thoughts so far as to observe exactly the difference of the two Opinions, which do at this day separate the Reformists, and Romanists, there were also some who knew the truth only in general. When then error came in thereupon, and building ill on a foundation, declared we must understand our Saviour is present in the Eucharist substantially and locally, that his Body and Blood are received in it by the mouth of our bodies, and that the sign of his Body is his Body in self, this was without doubt in effect an extraordinary novelty, and of which there was never heard any mention; but yet I do not find it strange that several people were deceived by it, and took this not for a novelty, but as an illustration of the common Faith. So far extends my fifth Observation.

BUT he ought not to stop here to raise a state of a question, he ought to see likewise what I add immediately after in the sixth Observation. Had the Author of the *Perpetuity* and Mr. Arnaud consulted it, they would have acknowledged that I gave therein a formal explication, and as it were a limitation to this general Principle which I laid down, that this does not wholly take place in enlightened Ages wherein there are eminent Pastors for knowledg that take care to instruct clearly their Flocks in the truths of Faith. For then their good instructions hinder the growth of Error, and render people capable of knowing and rejecting it. But it is wholly applicable to the Ages of darkness wherein Ignorance and Superstition have corrupted the Church. Which I express in these words, *Which will without doubt better appear if for a sixth remark we cast our eyes a little on the time wherein this change has most advanced it self. It was not in Hilaries nor Athanasius's times, nor in that of Ambrose and S. Austin, but in the 10th. and 11th. Centuries, that is to say in the most dark Ages, &c.* 'Tis no marvel then that Error made such conquests in those times, rather will it be a greater wonder if she did not. And this distinction (methinks) does sufficiently limit my Principle. To establish sincerely the state of our question these two remarks must not be separated, but joyn'd together to draw from them my whole sense, for the state of the question in my respect depends on my entire sense. Now my whole sense does not consist only in a general Principle which I lay down, nor in the general application I make of it, but in the exception and limitation I give them. But neither has Mr. Arnaud nor the Author of the *Perpetuity* dealt thus, choosing rather to run after their own chimerical notions than to follow the truth.

MORE-

MOREOVER, Mr. *Arnaud* shews he has but little to say, when he sets himself on reproaching me, that I suppressed some words of my fifth Observation; 'tis not likely I would on purpose suppress words contained in my Book, which might be easily found in turning over some leaves. If I passed over 'em 'twas because they made no more to the subject than those which I recite, which contain the whole substance of my discourse, and which are no less significant than the others. But I know not whether he can so well justify the Author of the *Perpetuity* in his making me say, *That the Church remained in this ignorance till Berenger's time*, altho there's no such thing in my Book. Mr. *Arnaud's* answer is, that the Author of the *Perpetuity* represents my sense, and not my words; and because that this proposition which this Author imputes to me is set down in Italick letters, which are those which are used for Quotations in proper terms. Mr. *Arnaud* says that 'tis the Printers fault who ought to Print them in a Roman letter. I will believe it because he says so, but yet my sense ought to be faithfully related, and for this effect plain dealing requires it to be drawn from my express declarations, contained in several passages of my first and second Answer, rather than from a discourse that is maim'd and which cannot represent in this condition but half of that which I would say. Whatsoever pains the Author of the *Perpetuity* and Mr. *Arnaud* have taken to disguise my sense, Father *Maimbourg* the Jesuite, who wrote since Mr. *Arnaud*, ingenuously perceived and related it as it is in truth. Mr. *Claude*, says he, asserts there was A CERTAIN TIME wherein through the neglect of the Pastors, Christians had no more than a confused knowledge of this mystery, without positively believing or rejecting either the Real Presence, or absence, because they studied not the point. This is in effect my meaning, and not that which the Author of the *Perpetuity* imputes to me, that the Faithful could remain a thousand years in the Church without forming a distinct notion, whether what they saw was or was not the true Body of Jesus Christ.

A Peaceable  
Method by  
Father Maim-  
bourg, ch. 3.  
page 108.

THE first of these three Remarks I now made, considers the point in respect of the Doctrine now in question, and determines it to the Real Presence alone, excluding Transubstantiation. The second considers it in respect of the persons, and determines it to the Christians only, excluding those that have no knowledge of our Mysteries; and the third considers it in respect of the time, and determines it to the Ages of Ignorance and Darkness: that is to say, to those wherein, according to us, the change was introduced, which are the 9th. and 10th. and part of the 11th. For altho, according to the exact rigour of the Dispute the Author of the *Perpetuity* be obliged to prove his Thesis from the time of the Apostles to that of *Berenger*; yet there being only to speak properly these three Ages in question in this Dispute, we shall neither complain of him, nor Mr. *Arnaud* when they shall restrain their Argument to these.

IT remains only now to know in what dispositions of mind we must suppose the Christians were; when we imagin the Doctrine of the Real Presence was declared to 'em; for on this depends the question, Whether the change which we pretend was possible or impossible?

BUT before we enter upon this enquiry, 'tis necessary to make two farther Observations. The first is, that the question is not whether the Christians of that time had knowledge enough to discover in some sort, when the Doctrine

Doctrine of the Real Presence was proposed to them, that it agreed not with the Principles of nature; but whether in supposing they believed not this Doctrine, they had knowledge enough to discover 'twas an innovation, contrary to the Churches Faith and to reject it under this consideration. For for to conclude that people would have actually opposed the Real Presence had they not before believed it, it is not enough to shew, that it would have opposed their senses and notices of reason. I confess that if men did always what they ought to do, this alone were sufficient to put them upon rejecting this Real Presence, as we have elsewhere proved it. But people are liable to be deceived, and receive notwithstanding the contradictions of sense and common reason, that which they are persuaded is a mystery of Faith, and generally as soon as ever they begin to consider it as a mystery, they hearken no longer to sense nor reason. We should then proceed, and shew that they were in a disposition to reject this Doctrine as a novelty, which the Church never held, and which consequently was not a true mystery of Faith.

THE other observation which we must make, is, that we ought to distinguish the belief of the Real Absence in the sense in question, from the belief of the corporeal Absence. To believe the corporeal absence, is to form to a man's self the idea of the ordinary and natural presence of a humane body, such as is that of our Saviour's, and to reject it as false and extravagant. But to believe the Real Absence in the terms of our Dispute, is to conceive the idea of an invisible Presence, such as the Roman Church conceives and rejects as an error. A man may reject the substantial Presence of the Body of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist under the notion of the ordinary existence of a body in a place, and yet not reject it, either generally under every notion, be it what it will, nor in particular under the notion of an invisible existence, after the manner of a Spirit; as appears from the example of the Roman Church, which does not believe this ordinary and natural Presence, but yet admits the invisible one. It would have been well if the Author of the *Perpetuity* had not used in this Dispute these equivocal terms of the Real Presence, and real Absence, which give way to sophisms, as will appear in what follows; but seeing he has used them, it is at least necessary to distinguish them, as I have now done.

LET us see then upon these illustrations what are the pretensions on either side. The Author of the *Perpetuity* maintains that these Christians must have a distinct knowledge either of the Presence or Real Absence, that is to say, they must have known distinctly whether that which they received in the Communion was or was not the Body of Jesus Christ in substance; for thus he understands it, there being no medium says he. I affirm on the contrary that they had not for the most part of 'em any distinct knowledge either of the invisible Real Presence, or the Real invisible Absence; and that they were not come as then to this distinct question, Whether the Body of Jesus Christ was invisibly present by its proper substance, and after the manner of a Spirit in the Eucharist or not.

SO far it seems that the method and state of this Dispute is clear, for 'tis likely by the Real Presence the Author of the *Perpetuity* means not the visible Presence, of which we do not dispute, and which the Church of Rome it self rejects, but the invisible Presence of which we dispute, and which the Roman Church holds; so that we need only propose the proofs of both parties



parties for the Readers edification. But Mr. *Arnaud* who can make clouds when he has occasion for 'em, has so greatly obscured this matter by distinctions, and crafty pretences, that we must still spend more time to clear the difficulties he has cast in our way.

TO believe, says he, the Real Absence is to believe that the Eucharist is not the Body of Jesus Christ, or that the Body of Jesus Christ is not really present in the Eucharist. Now a man may distinctly believe or know that one thing is not another, or that 'tis not in another in three different manners. The first by an express and formal reflection, but general when a man generally denies one thing to be another, or affirms that 'tis absent but without specifying any particular manner. Thus in denying the King to be at Paris, we say he is not there in any real manner, altho we specify not any one. The second by a distinct reflection on all the different manners of being a thing, or being really present in a place. Which is as if a man should say that the King is not at Paris neither visibly nor invisibly; and 'tis in this manner the Sacramentaries deny the presence of Christ's Body in the Eucharist. And the third without any reflection, and by a simple view of the nature of things which does so comprehend the exclusion of whatsoever belongeth not to their being, that the mind knows as well what they are not, as if it had made an hundred positive judgments on 'em. Applying afterwards this distinction he assures us first, That the Author of the Perpetuity never pretended to prove that if the Faithful believed not the Real Presence, they then believed the Real Absence in the second manner, which is to say, that they positively excluded, by a formal reflection, all the several kinds of presence. 2. That the greatest part of his Arguments conclude, that if the Faithful believed not the Real Presence they would have rejected it in the first manner, and by a general reflection which denies the thing without considering the different species. 3. That altho a man may draw this consequence from several of his Arguments, yet 'tis sufficient for his design to shew that these Faithful would have rejected the Real Presence in the third manner, that is to say, without reflection, and by a distinct knowledge of certain verities which include it according to the ordinary manner of conceiving things.

WE must then examin these three manners, and see in what sense the Author of the Perpetuity is obliged to maintain that if the Christians of whom we speak believed not the Real Presence, they then believed the Real Absence.

THE first is chimerical and impossible. For 'tis not possible for a man naturally to consider the Real Presence of the Body of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist to reject it; without conceiving at the same time in particular, some kind or manner of presence. Either these persons, to whom Mr. *Arnaud* attributes his first manner of believing the Real Absence, knew the invisible Presence, or did not know it. Supposing they knew it, what necessity was there of making them reject it in general, without specifying it in particular? Why not say, they rejected it in making a formal reflection on it? If they knew it not, as it seems Mr. *Arnaud* supposes, it is not at least possible but they had formally in their minds the particular idea of the corporeal and visible Presence. For as soon as ever we conceive a humane Body to be substantially present in a place, the first notion that offers it self naturally to the mind is that of the ordinary and corporeal Presence. It is possible we may conceive a humane body without thinking of the place wherein it is, we every day make such kind of abstractions as these, yet

'tis not possible according to nature for a man to conceive it to be present by its proper substance in a place without conceiving at the same time the idea of its corporeal Presence. Nature furnishing us with no other idea of the substantial Presence than that, it cannot be, but this idea will shew it self to the mind, as soon as ever we imagin a body in a place. To be present in a place, and that corporeally, are naturally one and the same idea in respect of a humane body. The Philosophy of later Ages has made two ideas of this, whether with reason, or not, I do not now dispute; but howsoever, nature makes but one of it, and whilst we do not distinguish them, nor know the secret of making two ideas of them, the one general, and th'other particular, we shall never make this abstraction, for nature puts not men upon making it. Now we speak here of persons that think according to nature, and suppose they never heard the least mention of invisible and incorporeal Presence, it is not then possible but they must immediately form the idea of the visible or corporeal Presence, in the same manner as 'tis not possible for a man naturally to conceive the Sun to be present over our Hemisphere, but he must conceive the idea of his visible and ordinary Presence. It is then certain that a man considered in the state of nature, void of the fancies of this new Philosophy, cannot believe the Real Absence of Christ's Body in the Sacrament, without thinking on the corporeal Presence. In this condition he can understand no other than that, and 'tis it which he rejects, because 'tis on it whereon falls the first conception of his mind. This will yet farther appear if we consider that the eyes of a Communicant will determin his thoughts to the corporeal Presence, when of it self it were not therein determined; for 'tis not possible for a man who never heard of the spiritual and invisible Presence to raise in his mind, at the same moment wherein he communicates this question, *Is the Body of Jesus Christ substantially present in this Eucharist which I receive?* but that he must at the same time use his eye-sight, to inform himself. This inclination is so natural that if he does not follow it, it must necessarily be said that he has in his mind the idea of an invisible Presence, of which his eyes cannot be witnesses, and that 'tis this idea which diverts him from having recourse to his sight; and if he does follow it, his eyes which tell him that it is not therein derermin his thoughts to the idea of the corporeal Presence to make him reject it.

**BUT** is it impossible that a man in conceiving the idea of the corporeal Presence, and in rejecting it, should conceive at the same time that there may be invented other manners of a substantial Presence, but must reject them all, be they what they will, without specifying or considering them. I answer, that in this case he will conceive these other manners of presence in opposition to the corporeal and visible one, and consequently will specify them at least as incorporeals and invisibles, and conceive them under this quality. In a word, when nature offers us but the idea of one single species, there arises not up immediately a general consideration in our minds, our fancy leads us to that particular species, and if afterwards we conceive any other, 'tis always in opposition to that which nature it self offers to our knowledg. Whence it follows that this first manner of believing the Real Absence by a general rejection of every kind of presence, yet without specifying so much as any one in particular neither visible nor invisible, is a mere chimera which resides only in Mr. Arnaud's brain.

**AS** to the third it is moreover invalid and illusory, seeing it answers not the design of the Author of the *Perpetuity*. For as we have already said, he

he is obliged to shew, that if people had not believed the Real invisible Presence, they would have had in their minds, dispositions, and prejudices, which would have made them respect it not barely as a Doctrine that appears contrary to natural reason, (this is not sufficient to produce actually an entire rejection and opposition when the matter concerns a point of Faith) but as an innovation in the Churches Belief. Now this third manner of believing the Real Absence without any reflection by a bare view of the nature of things, in the same manner as we know *Paris* is not *Rome*, nor *France* *Holland*, that the Sun is not the Moon, nor an House an Elephant, that the Kings Picture is not the King himself, to use Mr. *Arnaud's* examples; without having made this express and formal reflection; this manner I say, may make men capable of knowing that the Real Presence is contrary to the order of nature, that it agrees not with common sense, but not make 'em discern whether it be a mystery of the Churches Faith (as 'tis said to be) or whether 'tis a new humane invention. This simple view of the nature of things which consists in knowing, that the Eucharist is Bread, that the Eucharist is an image of the Body of Jesus Christ, that this Body is a humane Body, and that 'tis in Heaven, does not hinder a man from being surprized with the matter of novelty, by being persuaded that 'tis the true Doctrine of the Church (as 'tis assured to be) and on this persuasion Reason must yield to Faith.

'Tis in vain, Mr. *Arnaud* tells us, that supposing the Faithful had no other Lib. 6. cap. 2. pte 564, 565. than these simple notions, that the Sacrament of the Eucharist is Bread and Wine, which represent to us the Body of Jesus Christ, supposing they conceiv'd the Body of Jesus Christ to be in no wise therein, that they imagin'd this Body to be only present in Heaven, and that all the usual expressions form'd only in their minds the idea of a figurative Presence, they would immediately have judg'd that the belief of the Real Presence was false and impertinent; as we would immediately judg that man who would persuade us that *Paris* is *Rome*, or that the Popes Picture is the Pope himself; or that the seven stalks of Corn which Pharaoh dream'd of were really seven years, or the Paschal Lamb a real passage, and Sacrifices for Sins real Sins, to be mad and senseless. When a man judges of these things he simply judges of them according to the light of nature, and 'tis certain the light of nature will render that man impertinent who shall say what Mr. *Arnaud* makes him say. It would be the same concerning the real invisible Presence, should a man judg of it on this ground. But those that offer it in any age oppose against the light of Nature the splendid name of the Churches Faith. They endeavour to insinuate it under the pretence of its being a mystery of the Christian Religion, which has been always believed, and for this purpose they spare no colours. By which means they stop the course of nature, and hinder men from judging according to its Principles, reducing the question to know whether it be true that this be the Faith and perpetual sense of the Church, by which means 'tis no hard matter t' impose on the ignorant.

'TIS moreover in vain that Mr. *Arnaud* brings in the Statue of *Henry IV.* for an instance, which all the Parisians know to be only Brass, and that his body is only at *S. Dennis*. He says, perhaps they never thought of formally rejecting the opinion that this Statue is really the Body of *Henry IV.* and yet be ready to oppose this opinion, should any extravagant person offer to make them believe it. But howsoever the Parisians stand affected towards the Statue of *Henry IV.* there's a great deal of difference between

R r r

this



this example and that of the Eucharist here in question. The Statue of *Henry IV.* is a work of humane institution, wherein men suppose there's nothing supernatural; whereas the Eucharist is a Divine mystery, in which there has been always believed to be something above nature. The Statue of *Henry IV.* is a thing absolutely popular, concerning which every man believes he has liberty of judging according to the principles of Sense and Reason. The Eucharist is a mystery which has been endeavour'd to be made long since in some manner inaccessible to mens curiosity, by concealing it under a cloud of Ceremonies. *Henry* the Fourth was indeed a great Prince, whose memory will never die; but how great soever he deservedly was, yet is he consider'd only as a man whose body lies interred at *S. Dennis* in the same manner as others do. Jesus Christ is the Son of God, whose Body is living, and glorious, and hypostatically united to the Divinity. Should any man then imagin that the Statue of *Henry IV.* is really *Henry IV.* I doubt not but people would look upon him as a mad man, because 'twould be considered according to the light of nature as a thing touching which there can be nothing that's extraordinary and miraculous conceived, which is exposed to the knowledg of all the world, and wherein there's nothing at all that's Divine. Neither do I doubt but such a dotage would be rejected as a novelty unknown to our Fore-fathers, because 'twould be supposed that our Fore-fathers had their senses made as ours, and that in respect of natural and sensible things their judgments have been the same as ours, nature ever remaining in a uniform state. But neither this example nor th'others which are like it do signifie any thing in respect of the Eucharist which is a mystery of Faith, wherein all Christians agree that there's something supernatural, altho they agree not in the manner. A mystery concerning which every man does not think he can safely judg, much less from the principles of Sense and Reason: in fine, a mystery of the Son of God, the knowledg of which depends on a light which is not always equal. It is then manifest that neither this example nor the rest of the same rank proposed by Mr. *Arnaud* are pertinent.

NEITHER is it less clear from what I now represented, that of these three manners of believing the Real Absence, which Mr. *Arnaud* proposes, there's only the second which can be admitted into this Dispute, to regulate the state of the question, because the first, as I have shew'd, is impossible, and the last can yield no advantage to the Author of the *Perpetuity's* design.

Mr. *ARNAUD* may here again call to mind the solidity of the distinction which I made touching the two expressions which are very like one another, as to terms, but very different in sense, *not to believe, or not to know that a thing is, and to believe, or know that a thing is not.* The first denotes a bare negation of Knowledg, and the second a positive act of Knowledg and Faith, which formally denies the existence of a thing. *Not to believe the Real Presence*, barely signifies that this presence is not held for an Article of Faith; *but to believe that the Real Presence is not*, signifies something more, which is, that a man reckons it among the Articles which he rejects. The Author of the *Perpetuity* having said that there's no medium between having a distinct knowledg of the Real Presence, and having a distinct knowledg of the Real Absence, I had reason to tell him, that to make in this matter an immediate opposition, he must make it contradictory, and not contrary, that is to say, he ought to bring in an affirmation, or the negation of the same thing, and not the affirmation, or positive

sitive rejection, that he must say the Christians have had a distinct belief of the Real Absence, or that they have not had it; and not say they have had a distinct belief of the Presence, or Real Absence.

Mr. ARNAUD calls this *School-boys Philosophy*. But this School-boys Lib. 6. cap. 2. pag. 5. Philosophy; seeing he pleases to give it this name, is grounded on common sense. For common sense shews us that to make an immediate opposition we must set the negative on one side, and the affirmative on the other. We grant, says he, to Mr. Claude, that to speak logically we ought to oppose believing the Real Presence, and not believing the Real Presence, and not believing the Real Absence. But I affirm, that to speak rationally we may well oppose believing the Real Presence, and believing the Real Absence; which is to say, that not to believe the Real Absence, and to believe the Real Absence, may and ought to pass for the same thing in the point in question, because these two dispositions of mind have all the same effects.

I HAVE been ignorant till now of the distinction between speaking logically, and speaking rationally; for I always thought that true Logick, which tends only to cultivate our reason, and which explains it self clearly and intelligibly, had not any other language than what was rational. But not to stray from our subject, if in the matter in question, these two expressions, *not to believe the Real Presence, and to believe the Real Absence*, must pass for one and the same thing, it follows they are both of 'em equally rational at bottom. Seeing then they are both of 'em equally intelligible, and equally popular, why did not the Author of the *Perpetuity* make use of the first, rather than the second. For the first being as it is rational, intelligible, and popular as well as the other, it has moreover this advantage that Logick approves of it, whereas she rejects the other. The first expression does of it self explain justly and naturally what a man would say, neither more nor less; whereas the other, according to Mr. Arnaud's own acknowledgment is equivocal, and does not explain what's meant, but only because of the matter in question. The first is liable to no contest. The second is disputable. Wherefore then has not Mr. Arnaud knowing them to be equivalent, left the second to make use of the first. He had lost nothing, if it be true, they both signifie one and the same thing, and he had spared the pains of a new dispute. For I maintain against him, that neither rationally speaking, nor logically, these two expressions ought to pass for the same thing. The first cannot produce the effect which the second produces, seeing the second will make men oppose the Real Presence as an innovation which Faith rejecteth, whereof the first cannot of it self work such an effect. A man that is persuaded the Real Presence is a Doctrine which he ought to reject, will oppose himself against it, as soon as ever it shall be offered him. A person that never heard it mention'd will easily suffer himself to be surprized when told this has been ever the Faith of the Church.

WHEREIN consists then you'll say the point of our difference, and what is the state of this question? It may be easily gather'd from what I have now said, which is to know whether the people of the 9th. 10th. and 11th. Ages, in supposing the Real Presence which was taught them, that is to say, the invisible substantial Presence, such as the Church of Rome holds at this day; for 'tis on that we dispute, was a novelty, which yet was taught them as the ancient Faith of the Church. I say, the question is, whether these people had notions and prejudices in their minds, which must of necessity

make them reject this Doctrin as a novelty contrary to the ancient Faith, even so far as to oblige 'em plainly and openly to oppose it. And because these prejudices can be no other than this distinct belief, *That the Body of Jesus Christ is not substantially present in the Eucharist, neither in a visible nor invisible manner*, it concerns us to know whether one may rationally say in the terms of our supposition that they had this distinct belief. It lies upon Mr. *Arnaud* to prove the affirmative, and I the negative. This is the true state of this question, as appears from what we have seen in this Chapter. But because Mr. *Arnaud* has so openly and plainly renounced this manner of believing the Real Absence by a formal reflection on the several kinds of presence, whether visible or invisible, it may be reasonably said this is no longer a matter of contest between us. I grant him (if he will) that people have positively rejected the corporeal and visible Presence of the Body of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist, and that in this sense they have believed a Real Absence. I grant likewise if he will that these same people were in a capacity to know, that the light of nature opposes the Doctrin of the substantial and invisible Presence. He grants me for his part, that it does not appear they were for positively rejecting, and by a formal reflection this incorporeal and invisible Presence. Wherein then do we disagree? 'Tis clear that that which I grant him is not a sufficient disposition, whence to conclude that the people would have opposed the Doctrin of the invisible Presence as a novelty unknown to the Church. For, for to believe that Jesus Christ is not visibly and corporally present in the Eucharist, this does not hinder but that a man may embrace the opinion of the incorporeal Presence, and so likewise to know that the light of nature does not well agree with this invisible Presence, this does not hinder men from being deceived by imagining 'tis a mystery of Faith, which the Church has always believed, and touching which a man must not consult his sense or reason. It is no less clear that what Mr. *Arnaud* grants me is sufficient to conclude that the people here mention'd had no distinct knowledg of the Real Presence, in the sense in which the Roman Church believes it, neither to admit it, nor reject it; and consequently they had no necessary disposition to oppose it when 'twas first taught them. For as to this general rejection, we have shew'd it to be chimerical and impossible: The question is then decided, but in my favour, seeing the result of all these illustrations is, that the change which we suppose has been possible. Yet if Mr. *Arnaud* will obstinately maintain this general manner of believing the Real Absence, which denies every kind of substantial Presence without particularising any one of them, altho we have shew'd him 'tis fantastical, and contrary to nature; yet I say we will consent that the question be this, *Whether the people before-mentioned ought, according to our supposition formally and generally to deny all the several sorts of substantial presences of the Body of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist whatsoever they be, without specifying any one of them.* But this is what he has still to prove.



## CHAP. II.

*Mr. Arnaud's Proceedings Consider'd. His unjust Reproaches  
also Examined.*

**S**AINTE *Austin* describing the humor and carriage of some persons in his time with whom he was concern'd, observes they were very copious and eloquent in censuring the sentiments of others, but flat and dull in establishing their own opinions. *Ipsos*, says he, *animadvertēbam plus in refellendis aliis disertos & copiosos esse, quam in suis probandis certos & firmos manere.* Aug. de militi. cred. c. 1. Methinks the same may be said of Mr. *Arnaud*. For he troubles not himself with proving either the propositions he advances, nor those of the Author of the *Perpetuity*, and is never more busied than in censuring the opinions of others. So greatly is he in love with this kind of proceeding, that he scruples not many times to quit his principal subject, and fall upon any accidental one, provided 'twill but furnish him with a pretence to make objections; nay, sometimes he shall start fancies of his own on purpose to give himself this divertisement. Yet we must needs confess he has some reason to do thus, having a peculiar talent of ridiculing the most solid matters; for sometimes he tells me of having private Dictionaries to my self, other times of Keys, and Machines, rhetorical Enthusiasms, and a thousand other pretty fancies, which take with his Readers, and give him, together with the benefit of some slight objections and declamations thereupon, the liberty of breaking loose through the strongest Arguments.

**A**N example whereof may be seen in this Dispute of the distinct knowledge of the Real Presence, or Real Absence. For after the illustrations which we have given in the preceding Chapter, 'tis easie to find that Mr. *Arnaud* ought to establish this Proposition: that if the people of the 9th. and 10th. Centuries had not found themselves imbued with the distinct belief of the Real invisible Presence, they would have distinctly believed the Real invisible Absence, at least in a general manner, that is to say, they would have formally rejected every kind of substantial Presence of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist; yet without specifying ever a one of them in particular. He himself acknowledges that the Author of the *Perpetuity* would be understood to speak of this general manner of believing distinctly the Real Absence; so that it cannot be but the Readers must be in expectation of what he alledges for the confirming this Hypothesis. But they will find themselves much mistaken, for instead of applying himself to strengthen it, by new Arguments, or to maintain the Arguments of the Author of the *Perpetuity* in restraining them to the time in question, he has rather chosen to employ the rest of his sixth Book in examining the state of the people of the first six Centuries, not that 'twas necessary to enter upon this examination, seeing these Ages are out of the bounds of our Dispute touching the change. But seeing he would only refute the five ranks of persons whom I supposed to be in the Church before the opinion of the Real Presence appeared, refute them I say in reference to the eight first Centuries to have thence occasion to multiply his objections. I may with good reason be dispensed withal from following him; for to speak properly, 'tis mere running  
into

into fruitless debates. Yet to omit nothing, I will still patiently hearken to what he has to say on this subject. Before I enter upon the discussion of his particular objections against my five ranks of persons, 'twill not be amiss to examin some of his general ones, for we must endeavour to satisfy him in all things.

*Lib. 6. cap. 4.  
pag. 550.*

FIRST then Mr. Arnaud makes me contradict my self. He says, *That if it be not true I admitted the confused Belief during ten Ages, if I included it in the 9th. and 10th. it follows that I knew that during eight Centuries the Faithful had a distinct knowledg of the mystery of the Eucharist.* I acknowledge this Consequence to be just enough. But, adds he, *Mr. Claud bethinks himself and finds 'tis more for his advantage to grant nothing to the Author of the Perpetuity, and even to affirm that during these eight Centuries the Faithful had no distinct knowledg of the Presence, or Real Absence.* Why does Mr. Arnaud call this recollecting a man's self? What contrariety is there between these two things? Not, says he, *but that there's an equivocation in all this.* If there be any equivocation, Mr. Arnaud ought not to make a contradiction of it, nor say I am at discord with my self. But the truth is, there is neither equivocation nor contradiction in it; for we have already told him, that to know distinctly the mystery of the Eucharist, is neither to know distinctly the Real Presence, nor Real Absence, and that there's a difference in these things. To know distinctly the Real Absence in the sense wherein we take this term in this Dispute, is to reject formally, and by a positive act this invisible Presence as an error. But to know distinctly the mystery of the Eucharist, is according to us, to know clearly that the Eucharist is Bread and Wine, as to the substance of it, that by Consecration this Bread and Wine are made signs or mystical figures of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, that this signification is grounded on several relations which are between the Bread and Wine, and the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, that those who receive these Symbols with Faith and Devotion towards Jesus Christ who died for us, and rose again, and is reigning in Heaven, they spiritually eat of his Body and drink of his Blood, that these Symbols are called the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ by a Sacramental way of speech, because they do both represent them to our Faith, or because there's a great conformity between them, and the things which they represent, or because they communicate them to us, and several other like Articles. In a word, to understand the mystery of the Eucharist is to know positively wherein consists the nature and essence of a Sacrament, which does not include any distinct knowledg either of the Real invisible Presence, or Real invisible Absence. I acknowledge 'tis not easie to surprize people that are in this capacity, nor persuade them that this Real Presence has been ever believed in the Church, especially if they have Pastors that are learned and honest, who acquit themselves of their Duty, and watch diligently over their Flocks. But howsoever this is not to understand distinctly the Real Absence in question.

IN the mean time to the end Mr. Arnaud may no longer equivocate on this subject, let me tell him, that when we attribute this distinct knowledg of the mystery of the Eucharist to the eight first Centuries, we would not be understood either that they had it in a degree always equal and uniform, or that all persons who lived in each of those Ages have been equally enlightened. We know the light of those Ages was diminished by degrees, so that the 7th. and 8th. had much less of it than the first six. We know likewise there

there has been always in the Church, I mean even then when 'twas most flourishing, a great number of pious Christians in truth, but little advanced in knowledge, and with them multitudes of prophane worldly wretches who little concerned themselves touching what they believed of the mysteries of Christian Religion.

IN the second place Mr. *Arnaud* reproaches me with having done two things, which would be strange enough were they true: the one, that I ill explain'd the Author of the *Perpetuity's* sentiment, and th'other that I granted him in effect whatsoever he pretended to. He grounds these two reproaches on that I said somewhere to the Author of the *Perpetuity*, *That if he meant that the Faithful who took the instructions of the Fathers in a metaphorical sense, believed Jesus Christ present corporeally in Heaven without thinking on what has been said since, that he is at the same time in Heaven and on Earth, there after the manner of a Body, here after the manner of a Spirit, I acknowledged that the Faithful had in this sense a most distinct idea of the Real Absence, which is to say, they did not at all believe that he was substantially present in the Sacrament, applying their whole mind to the presence of his Grace and Merit, setting themselves to meditate on his infinite love, &c. without exerting their thoughts to this presence of substance, invented of late by the Roman Church. But if by having an idea and distinct belief of the Real Absence, that Author meant they knew and rejected distinctly this means of existence of the Body of Jesus Christ on the Altar, in multiplying his Presence in several places, I affirm'd they had it not at all.*

Answer to the  
second Treatise,  
part 2.  
chap 3.

BUT these two reproaches are without grounds, for in respect of the first it appears from what we have seen in the preceding Chapter, that the Author of the *Perpetuity* must have pretended to that which I charge him with; to wit, that the Faithful have had the distinct idea of the substantial invisible Presence, such as the Church of *Rome* believes, and that they formally rejected it as an Error. For there's only this manner of believing the Real Absence which can have place in this Dispute, seeing that of the three which Mr. *Arnaud* has proposed the first as we have seen, is impossible, and the third useless for the design of the Author of the *Perpetuity*; so that necessarily his sense must fall upon the second, which is precisely that which I have attributed to him. And as to the second reproach 'tis clear, that if the Author of the *Perpetuity* pretended to no more than what I granted him, his Argument will fall to the ground; for it does not follow from persons not fixing their minds on the presence of an invisible substance, such as the Church of *Rome* teaches, and their applying themselves only to meditate on a presence of Grace, which is precisely what I grant him, it does not hence follow, I say, that they are led by this alone to reject the Real Invisible Presence, as a novelty contrary to the Faith of the Church. There needs something more than this, I mean there needs greater lights to inevitably effect this rejection. For a man must have for this not only the idea of this substantial invisible Presence, such as is fancied in the Church of *Rome*, but likewise distinctly know that such a Presence was never taught in the Church. For otherwise 'tis very possible that people will suffer themselves to be deceived, when told the Church has ever believed such a Presence, especially when they shall hear several passages out of the Fathers on this subject alledged in a counter sense. Moreover, if Mr. *Arnaud* imagins I meant to acknowledg of my own head, that one may call the disposition of these persons who believ'd Jesus Christ corporally present in Heaven,

(with-



(without considering what has been said since of his Presence in Heaven and on Earth at the same time, there visibly, here invisibly) believing the Real Absence, he is grossly mistaken. For what I said was out of condescension, and supposition, and not absolutely, which is to say, that in case the Author of the *Perpetuity* pretended only this, I would not dispute with him about an expression. In effect if we are agreed touching the thing, I'll never make war with him upon the account of terms.

First Treatise  
of the *Perpetuity*, page 37.

Answer to the  
first Treatise,  
page 12.

Lib. 6. ch. 5.  
pag. 560.

Page 562.

Mr. ARNAUD is no less mistaken when he accused me for making an illusory answer to the Author of the *Perpetuity*. The business is, that this Author said, that if the change which we pretend were true, *There must have been of necessity a time wherein the belief of the Real Presence has been so mixt with that of the Real Absence, that there were half of the Bishops, Priests, and People, who held the one, and the other half that held the other.* To this I answer'd, *That in the times of the greatest ignorance, even in the 11th. Century, I doubted not but there were four or five ranks of persons in the Body of the visible Church, the one profane and worldly persons who kept themselves at a distance from these Disputes; others ignorant ones, who contented themselves with knowing in general, the Eucharist to be the memorial of Christs Passion, and that they receive therein his Body and Blood, these holding the true Faith in a degree of confused knowledg. The third, of those that held the true Faith in a degree of distinct knowledg, and rejected the substantial Presence. And the fourth, of those that had embraced the Opinion of this Presence.* And this is what Mr. Arnaud calls an illusion. Whereas I affirm this answer is pertinent; for if there have been four ranks of men in the Church, 'tis ill done of the Author of the *Perpetuity* to reduce them to two. But, says Mr. Arnaud, the Author of the *Perpetuity* speaks of the time before Berenger, and you speak of the time that followed him. I answer that the Author of the *Perpetuity* speaks of the time of the chimerical growth through which the belief of the Real Presence hath necessarily passed according to the imagination of the Calvinists: And thus doth he formally explain himself. And I speak of the time wherein Error made its greatest progress, in the greatest progress of error. These are my words. So far there's nothing mis-understood, we speak both of us concerning the same time. But this time according to us is that in which Berenger began to oppose the Real Presence. But, says moreover Mr. Arnaud, *the whole Church had already passed over into the belief of the Real Presence before Berenger's time, and Aubertin himself acknowledges as much.* Which is what I deny, and Mr. Arnaud ought not to affirm it without proof. The greatest progress of the Real Presence was then when Berenger declaring himself against it, Paschasius his Disciples maintain'd it by Disputes; so that this is precisely the time about which the Author of the *Perpetuity* and I debated.

Page 563.

THESE are the first objections of Mr. Arnaud, after which he divides what he calls my System into three parts or times. *The first, says he, comprehends the first eight Ages, and the five ranks whereof it consists. The second contains two Centuries and an half, which a man cannot better name than the unaccountable time of the Ministers, And the third contains the time which follow'd Berenger.* 'Tis certain that of these three times there was only the second (as I already said to speak properly) necessary to be examin'd touching the question, Whether the change which we pretend was possible or impossible. For altho I do not grant that all the Faithful of the eight first Centuries have had a distinct knowledg either of the Real Presence,

sence, or Real Absence in the sense wherein the Church of *Rome* takes these terms, yet did I acknowledg there was then light enough in the Church, whereby to reject the Opinion of this sort of Presence, had it appear'd, so that it does not seem 'twas greatly necessary to dispute concerning these Ages, wherein we do not say the change was made, and which we suppose to have been different from those which followed. Yet seeing Mr. *Arnaud* will needs have 'em brought into the Dispute, I am willing to treat of them.

I THEN reckon'd in the Church five sorts of persons, who had no distinct knowledg of the Real Presence, neither to reject nor admit it, without comprehending therein the prophane or worldly minded persons, and grounded my division on this reason. That 'tis not possible in this great diversity of conditions and humors of men, to reduce them all either to one and the same measure of knowledg, or to the same form of action.

Answer to the  
second Treatise,  
part 2.  
chap. 3.

THE first rank is of those who conceiv'd these two terms the Sacrament, and the Body of Jesus Christ, the Sacrament under the notion which their senses gave them; for whether 'twas call'd Bread, or by any other name, the idea they form'd thereof was such as their eyes represented them with. They conceiv'd the Body of Jesus Christ after the manner which the Gospel speaks of it, as a body, and flesh like unto that which we have, born of a Virgin, united to the Eternal Word, hanging on the Cross, risen and taken up into Glory, and in a word under the idea which Religion gives us of it. The idea of the Sacrament served to make them pass on to that of the Body, but they stopt there, and made not a particular reflection thereon, how the Sacrament was the Body of Jesus Christ. Their devotion being content with the use which they made of the Sacrament, unto which they were assisted by this formulary of Communion, *Corpus Christi*, they proceeded not so far as that question.

THE second rank is of those who proceeded to the question, How this visible Bread, this subject call'd Sacrament, is the Body of Jesus Christ? but finding a great deal of inconsistency in the terms, their minds stopt at the single difficulty without undertaking to solve it.

THE third is of those who going as far as the question, proceeded as far as the solution, but their minds stopt at general terms, as that Jesus Christ is present to us in the Sacrament, and that we receive his Body and Blood therein without searching after greater satisfaction.

THE fourth is of those who having been disgusted at the inconsistency of these terms, the Bread and the Body of Jesus Christ, found at length the real knot of the question, I mean, that the Bread is the Sacrament, the memorial, and pledg of the Sacred Body of our Redeemer.

THE fifth in fine is of those who at the hearing of these propositions, *The Bread is the Body of Jesus Christ, The Bread is chang'd into the Body of Jesus Christ, the Bread is made the Body of Jesus Christ*, went immediately to their true and natural sense, without perplexity or difficulty, and without so much as thinking on the inconsistency of the terms, well understanding that the Bread remaining Bread is consecrated to be a Sacrament, which represents and communicates to us the Lords Body; and these had a

more clear and distinct knowledge of the truth, and a greater disposition to understand the stile and usual expressions of the Church.

*Lib. 6. ch. 5.  
pag. 560.*

*HERE'S*, says Mr. Arnaud, what Mr. Claude calls the happy days of the Church, and the time of the distinct knowledge. And yet of these five ranks there are three who knew not what the Eucharist was, and understood not the sense of the expressions which form this Doctrine. The fourth sought and happily found it, says he, after a long search, and the fifth found it without searching it.

I ACKNOWLEDG that what has been said of these five ranks, may be understood of all the time which preceded the change, but yet we may divide this time into two, and distinguish that wherein the Pastors took a more particular care to instruct the people, and that of ignorance wherein the mysteries of the Gospel were neglected, and the people ill instructed. For as ignorance was never so great, nor universal, but that there were ever some persons knowing enough to understand distinctly, that the Bread is call'd the Body of Jesus Christ, because 'tis the Sacrament of it, so knowledge never so generally overspread the Church, but there were always some weak and ignorant persons in it. When we distinguish a time of knowledge, from a time of ignorance, we do not mean there were no ignorant people, during the time of knowledge, nor enlightned persons during the time of ignorance. We do not thus understand it. But we take the denomination from the party that most prevail'd, and call a time of light, and knowledge, that wherein we see appear more learning and clearness; a time of darkness, and ignorance that wherein we find on the contrary appear much more thickness and stupidity. When then I said that I reckon'd these five ranks of persons in the Church, I understood that this was true in both the two times, that is to say, both in that which I called the Churches happy days, the time of a distinct knowledge, and in that of ignorance and confusion; but I likewise meant that this was true in these two times diversly according to the difference which distinguishes them, so that when the sense of my proposition is distributed, reason requires that the proportion of each time be kept. We must not doubt but that in the first six Centuries there were persons to be found of these three first ranks which I denoted, but far fewer than in the following Ages.

*Lib. 6. ch. 6.  
pag. 563.*

AFTER this first remark Mr. Arnaud makes another, which is, that I do not prove what I offer touching these five orders, *This is*, says he, *an History no where extant. These are news which he alone knows, and for which he can bring no more proof than for worlds in the Moon.* But this is Mr. Arnaud's usual course, when he cannot answer an Argument he requires proofs for it, and so when he cannot invalidate an Answer he bethinks himself of saying, *prove it.* The Author of the *Perpetuity* affirms that the change which we pretend is impossible, I affirm 'tis possible, and to shew that it is so, I suppose by way of explication and illustration five ranks of persons in the Church during the time which preceded the change. If I suppose a thing impossible or absurd, it lies upon Mr. Arnaud to shew the impossibility or absurdity thereof, and not to require proofs of me. I suppose nothing but what lies within the terms of probability, and is conformable to the manner of mens thoughts, which appears by their every days actions in like occasions as this, altho not recorded in History. Howsoever if Mr. Arnaud will have the Authors Argument of the *Perpetuity* to remain in force, he



he should solidly attack my Answer and lay aside those fooleries of worlds in the Moon, which do not well agree with the importance of our subject.

AND this he seems to be sensible of, for he does not much insist on this demand of proofs, but comes to a particular examination of these diverse ranks, and to make it the more pleasant, he gives each of 'em a nickname and title; the first he calls the rank of Contemplative Ignoramus's, the next that of Lazy Ignoramus's, the third that of Catholicks, the fourth of Considerate Calvinists, the fifth that of Inconsiderate ones. In discoursing on the first rank he gives us a touch about *Mental Prayer*, of being *snatched up immediately into Heaven*, concerning *our meditation on the Body of Jesus Christ in abstracto*, and *standing upon our guard against the terms which express the essence of the Mystery*; and he uses the same pleasant method about the rest, which shews he can be frolicksome sometimes, and has his hours of creation, as well as other folks.

BUT laying aside these fine words, let us come to things. The Author of the *Perpetuity* intending to prove that the Faithful ever had a distinct knowledge of the Presence or Real Absence, offer'd the formulary of Communion *Corpus Christi*, which was used in the ancient Church, saying that these terms represented the Body of Jesus Christ present on the Altar; and thence he concluded they had a distinct belief that it was thereon, if they follow'd the sense of these words, or if they rejected them, they had a distinct belief of the Real Absence.

Refutat. part 2.  
chap. 2.

TO this I answer'd, that the first impression which things make on our minds, and words design'd to any use, is that of their use, that 'tis thus every morning that we conceive of the light, not as being under the notion of a body or accident, or motion of air, but under the notion of a thing which is useful to us, and serves to lead us to our labors, which I farther illustrated by several other examples. Then applying this remark to my subject, I said that this formulary *Corpus Christi*, was a formulary of use, design'd according to the intention of the Church to raise up the minds of Communicants to the meditating on the Body of Jesus Christ dead and risen for them. Whence I concluded there were several persons who contented themselves with doing that to which these words excited them, without proceeding any farther, their minds being sufficiently taken up with that. And this is that which Mr. Arnaud calls *extravagant and fantastical*, and wherein he meets with such *ridiculous Hypotheses, senseless suppositions, and absurdities*. 'Tis impossible, says he, for a discourse to be more faulty than this, altho it be the foundation of the first order of this system. First, 'twill not serve the end whereunto 'tis design'd. Secondly, 'tis laid on a false foundation. Thirdly, it concludes nothing this false foundation being supposed. These three remarks are essential, and need only proving.

Answer to the  
second Treat.  
part 2. ch. 2.

AS to the first, he says, *That supposing this ridiculous Hypothesis were granted me, yet there must be made several others to draw thence the conclusion which I draw.* First, *It must be supposed that the Pastors who instructed the Communicants when they first received the Eucharist, taught 'em only to make a Mental Prayer over the Body of Jesus Christ, without mentioning to 'em a word of the essence of the mystery, and sense of the words which express it, and satisfying the doubts which might spring up in their minds about it.* And yet the form of these instructions appearing in the Writings of S. Cyril of

Jerusalem, S. Ambrose, Gaudencius, and Eucherus, are very apt to imprint on their minds the distinct idea of the Faith of the Mystery, according to the Doctrin of the Catholicks. Secondly, We must suppose that when these people met with this expression either in Sermons, or particular Discourses, or Books, that the Eucharist is the Body of Jesus Christ, they caution'd themselves against admitting into their minds any idea of these words, but were immediately ravish'd with abstracted Meditations. Thirdly, 'Tis to be supposed that this lasted 'em all their lives. Fourthly, We must suppose they used the same caution against these expressions, The Bread is changed into the Body of Jesus Christ, the Body of Jesus Christ is made of Bread, we are nourish'd with the Body of Jesus Christ, that the Body of Jesus Christ enters into us, that it is our strength and our life.

I ANSWER, that supposing the Proposition I stated touching the things, and usual expressions, were fruitless in respect of the instructions given to the Catechumenists, and those other expressions mention'd by Mr. Arnaud, yet does it not hence follow but 'twould be useful in respect of these terms *Corpus Christi* which were spoken before to the Communicants at the time wherein the Eucharist is deliver'd to 'em. Now 'tis precisely upon this account I made use of it, that is to say, to answer the Argument which the Author of the *Perpetuity* rais'd from these words *Corpus Christi*, which he said represented the Body of Jesus Christ present on the Altar. I shew'd then that these words were not only words of instruction, but likewise of use; the drift of which were to represent to the Communicants the Body of Christ dead and risen for us. Mr. Arnaud ought to consider my proposition in reference to the particular end for which I used it, and not take it loose (as he has done) from the sequel of my discourse. But 'tis his custom when he proposes any thing which I mention, to represent it indirectly, and 'tis on such kind of proceedings as these whereon are grounded the greatest part of his objections.

TO confirm the truth of my Proposition, 'tis not necessary to change any thing in the Catechisms of the Fathers; there needs only one thing be supposed, which is not hard to believe, which is, that neither the Catechisms of S. Cyril, nor those attributed to S. Ambrose, and S. Eucherus, were used as forms of instructions which were given to persons the first time they Communicated, seeing the greatest part amongst 'em received their first Communion, immediately after they were Baptized in their tender years, yea sometimes whilst at their Mothers Breasts. I confess indeed they were not then taught to make Mental Prayers, as Mr. Arnaud speaks; and 'tis also likely they had neither the Catechisms of S. Ambrose, nor S. Cyril expounded to 'em, as he pleasantly supposes. And thus Mr. Arnaud's first Observation is absurd.

AS to the Books they read, 'tis not necessary to say, they caution'd themselves against the words which they met in 'em, we need only suppose one thing which is not unlikely. That there were at that time, and are at this day in the Church several people who could not read, and that amongst such as could, there were some that read little in the Treatises of the Fathers concerning the Eucharist, Books not being then so common as they have been since Printing has been invented, and in fine, that amongst those who did, there might be some who applied not themselves attentively enough to form in their minds the question how the Sacrament is our Saviour's Body.

A S

AS to private Discourses, if Mr. Arnaud by revelation knows any thing of 'em we'll hear him willingly, in the mean time he'll let us suppose, that there have been always people in the Church, who never set themselves to treat of abstruse questions of Theology in familiar Colloquies.

AND as to Sermons, seeing Mr. Arnaud pretends they must inspire all persons with curiosity that hear them, 'twould be just he should tell us, first whether he believes the Preachers handled always the Eucharist in difficult terms, sufficient to excite the curiosity of their hearers touching the question how the Bread is the Body of Jesus Christ. Whether they explain'd not themselves in terms clear and easie, which gave no occasion for this question. Secondly, 'Twould be just for him to tell us, whether when they made these difficult discourses they caused all the Faithful in general to come to 'em, and charged 'em not to fail of forming in their minds the question, How the Bread is the Body of Jesus Christ. Thirdly, In short it might be expected he should tell us whether he believes that all the Auditors were of equal capacities to make reflections on the difficult expressions of the Fathers. For if he does not suppose these three things, there's little likelihood these expressions he mentions must have produc'd the effect in mans minds which he pretends. Perhaps persons of mean capacities, who yet may be good men (altho they have but little knowledg) in hearing their Preachers would have turn'd their minds sooner on the side of easie terms, than that of difficult ones. Perhaps also some of 'em did let these difficult ways of speaking pass without considering 'em with much attention, and troubling themselves with questions beyond their reach: and thus may I suppose the expressions of the Fathers seldom made any deep impression on them.

Mr. CLAUDE, says Mr. Arnaud, who thinks that the putting of an extravagancy into mood and figure, is sufficient to make it conclusive and decisive, proposes us this in an insulting manner. What likelihood, says he, is there people should proceed to reflections on this mystery & inform themselves whether it be really Jesus Christ or not? I answer, the question here concerns the eight first Ages, and what he alledges I said, was meant of the time of the most gross ignorance, as 'twill appear to him that shall take the pains to see my words in the proper place whence he has taken them. He has not done fairly in this matter. For altho it be acknowledged that in the time wherein the Pastors took care to instruct their Flock, there might be some persons who proceeded not to the question, how the Sacrament was the Body of Jesus Christ? yet would we not be understood to speak generally of the people of that time, as if there were no difference between them and those that lived in the time when ignorance most prevail'd.

BUT, says Mr. Arnaud further, There's nothing more wonderful than the alliance which Mr. Claude makes in this imaginary order, of two qualities the most irreconcilable in the world. Every body knows that an high Contemplation does ordinarily suppose a higher knowledg of Mysteries than is to be expected in the common sort of the Faithful. Yet it seems the persons of which this rank consists were on one hand so stupid that they compréhended nothing in the most ordinary expressions amongst the Christians, altho their ears were struck with 'em in a thousand manners; and yet so spiritual on the other, that at the sight of the Sacrament, or upon the least mention of it, they had immediately  
their



*their whole hearts so fixt on the Body of their Saviour, that they could not reflect on the words used in the celebration of the mystery, or popular instructions.*

EVERY body knows that to raise up one's devotion to our Saviour Christ who died and rose again for us, 'tis not necessary to have a very high knowledge of Mysteries. As the Death of Jesus Christ, and his Resurrection are the most necessary notions of Christianity, so are they likewise the first; and if a man be not spiritual enough to send up his Devotions to our Saviour, 'tis certain he is no Christian. Neither need a man be very knowing to comprehend that the Sacrament is design'd for this use. The whole action of the Eucharist leads the most simple to this, and the *sursum corda* which they understood put them in mind of it. But to make reflections on the expressions of the Fathers, when they call the Eucharist the Body of Jesus Christ, or said the Bread was the Body of Jesus Christ, this requires greater ability and curiosity. As to the first, which is the lifting up our hearts to our Saviour Christ dead and risen, it needs only be supposed that the persons of this first rank now before us, had learned their *Creed*, that they were not ignorant our Saviour died and rose again for us, and knew the Eucharist was intended to make us remember him. Now there are few Christians but know this. But as to the second, which is to make reflections on the expressions of the Fathers, 'tis to be supposed they had retain'd the common expressions which their Pastors used in their Sermons or Books, and because they were many, and very different from one another, some having no difficulty, and others on the contrary being hard to be understood, we may imagin they precisely applied themselves to the difficult ones, without contenting 'emselfes with the others: 'tis likewise to be supposed they had compared together these two ideas, that of the Sacrament, and that of the Body of Jesus Christ, and remarkt the differences by a formal act of Meditation. Now all this requires some application of 'mind, without which 'tis very possible that simple people may remain in the Christian profession. Thus we see what's become of Mr. *Arnaud's* first Remark, and whether my supposition touching the persons of the first rank, ought to be respected as an extravagant and senseless distinction.

Mr. *ARNAUD's* second Remark contains, *That 'tis false the use of this expression Corpus Christi, which was spoken to those who Communicated, was according to the intention of the Church, to make them meditate on the Body of Jesus Christ in abstracto; that 'tis certain on the contrary, that this formulary Corpus Christi was design'd to instruct them in the truth of the mystery, and exact from 'em the confession of it, so that 'twas a formulary of Instruction and a profession of Faith, and not of Practice and Action.*

THIS discourse has all the characters of a person that finds himself intangled. What means he by meditating on the Body of Jesus Christ in *abstracto*? Is it meditating on his Death, Resurrection, and sitting on the right hand of the Father? 'Tis certain that this was the intention of these words according to the design of the Gospel, as appears by the testimonies which I alledged from the Author of the Commentaries attributed to *S. Hierom*, *Primasus* an African Bishop, and *S. Basil*; and this may be confirm'd by several other passages, and by these words of *S. Augustin*, *We call Bread and Wine that which being taken from the Fruits of the Earth, and consecrated by the mystical Prayer, is received by us for the Salvation of*  
our

of our souls in remembrance of the Death which our Lord has suffered for our sakes: And by these of *Tatianus*, Jesus Christ having taken the Bread and Wine, testified they were his Body and Blood, and commanded his Disciples to eat and drink thereof, in remembrance of his approaching Sufferings and Death. But for this purpose 'twere better to read the words of *S. Paul*. Every time ye eat of this Bread, and drink of this Cup, ye declare the Lords Death till he comes. If by meditating on the Body of Jesus Christ in abstracto, he means the meditating on it without conceiving it present on the Altar, 'tis not sufficient to say 'tis false, that this was the design of this formulary, *Corpus Christi*, according to the intention of the Church, he must prove that the Church meant by these words to represent this Body present in its proper substance in the Eucharist, which is what he must prove if he designs to uphold the Author of the *Perpetuity's* Argument, and does not think it sufficient, to say, *This is most false*.

*T H I S* formulary, says he, was design'd to instruct them in the truth of the mystery: Who doubts it? It was a formulary of use, and instruction both together, as I plainly intimated in my answer to the Author of the *Perpetuity* 3 It behoves us only to know what is this truth of the mystery in which it instructs men. 'Twas, says he, moreover a formulary and profession of Faith, and not of Practice and Action. And I say 'twas both the one and the other. I have proved 'twas a formulary of Practice, I acknowledg 'twas a formulary of profession of Faith. But that this Faith of which it required the profession was the substantial Presence of Jesus Christ in the Sacrament, is what I deny and what *Mr. Arnaud* ought to prove. I prove it, says he, by the word *Amen* which the Communicants answered. The *Amen* which the Communicants pronounced, signifies nothing less than this Presence of substance. The Book of the Initiated attributed to *S. Ambrose* draws thence only this conclusion *vere carnis illius Sacramentum est*; It is truly the Sacrament of the Flesh of Jesus Christ. The Author of the Book of Sacraments, wrongly cited by *Mr. Arnaud*, under the name of *S. Ambrose*, refers it to the Spiritual Communion of Jesus Christ himself, which we have in the Sacrament. *S. Austin* refers it to our selves, being made the Body of Jesus Christ and his Members. The Author of the Treatise of Dressing the Lords Field, refers it to the Faith of the Death of Jesus Christ, and effusion of his Blood. *Pope Leo* refers it to the reality of the humane Nature of Jesus Christ, against the Error of the *Eutichiens*. And it signifies nothing for *Mr. Arnaud* to offer so earnestly what this Pope says, *Hoc ore sumitur quod fide creditur, & frustra ab illis Amen responderetur à quibus contra id quod accipitur disputatur*, for 'tis clear enough that these terms signifie nothing else but that the Sacrament which we receive with our mouths, is a declaration and confirmation of what we ought to believe, to wit, that Jesus Christ has assumed a real humane Nature, because 'tis the Sacrament of his real Body which we receive, and that the *Amen* which is answered is the Seal of this truth, so that when the Hereticks dispute against it, they dispute against the very *Amen* which they pronounce. And this is the sense of *Leo*, in all which there's no substantial Presence.

AS to what remains, *Mr. Arnaud* takes a strange liberty. I told the Author of the *Perpetuity* that this formulary *Corpus Christi* was a formulary of use and action designed for the stirring up of the Communicants to meditate on the Death of Jesus Christ, and prov'd it very clearly by these words of the Author of the Commentaries attributed to *S. Hierom*. Our Saviour

*Saviour has given us his Sacrament to the end that by this means we should always remember THAT HE DIED FOR US, AND THEREFORE WHEN WE RECEIVE IT FROM THE HAND OF THE PRIEST, WE ARE TOLD THAT 'TIS THE BODY AND BLOOD OF JESUS CHRIST; and by those of Primasus, Every time we do this we ought to remember, THAT JESUS CHRIST DIED FOR US; AND THEREFORE WE ARE TOLD 'TIS THE BODY OF CHRIST, to the end that remembring what he has done for us we may not be ungrateful. What does Mr. Arnaud hereupon? He conceals these passages, and concludes from his own authority, That these notions of use, and this extasie of the Soul immediately transported by these words Corpus Christi to the meditation of the Body of Jesus Christ in abstracto, are Mr. Claudes Dreams, exactly opposite to the sentiments of the Fathers, and the Churches intention, and that there's small likelihood the faithful would depart from them to dive immediately into these kind of Meditations.*

'TIS certain Mr. Arnaud can conquer when he pleases, he suppresses my Arguments, recites my words in a contrary sense, turns things into ridicule, and flourishes all this over with passionate expressions. But proceed we to his third remark.

Page 573.

IT affirms I conclude nothing tho the false Principle on which I ground my Arguments were supposed a true one. *Altho, says he, 'twere true that these words Corpus Christi were not designed by the Church to instruct the Faithful, but only to excite in them certain inward motions, and set them on meditating upon the Body of Jesus Christ; yet this intention of the Church hindred 'em from understanding the sense of these words: and 'twould be still ridiculous to suppose, that these ignorant persons should so immediately enter upon the practice of these inward motions, that they could not understand the terms which the Church made use of to excite them.*

Answer to the  
second Treatise  
of the  
Perpetuity  
part 2. ch. 2.  
page 259. In  
Quarto Edit.

I ANSWER, Mr. Arnaud charges me with two things unjustly, the first, That I affirm this Formulary was not design'd by the Church to instruct the Faithful, but only to excite internal motions in them, which I never imagin'd: I affirm'd expressly the contrary, as may be seen by whosoever shall consult that part of my answer noted in the Margin. There's little sincerity in this imputation; and as little in charging me with a conclusion which I do not draw, and in suppressing that which I do. I do not conclude the intention of the Church which design'd these terms, *Corpus Christi* to excite inward motions in the Souls of the Communicants, should hinder them from understanding the sense of these words. I know that as the use which is made of things does not hinder but we may consider the nature of 'em if we will, so that which is made of words does not hinder a man from examining their sense. But, I say, there are several persons who stop at the bare notion of use without going farther, and thence I concluded it may be well supposed that in the ancient Church there were several persons who hearing the words *Corpus Christi* when they Communicated, applied themselves only to the practice of the inward affections of devotion, which these terms excited, without going any farther, and making reflection on what the terms, being applied to the Sacrament signifi'd. Let any man now judge, whether my supposition be ridiculous, extravagant and senseless, as Mr. Arnaud would make people believe; or whether 'tis not rather by a spirit of contradiction that Mr. Arnaud has taken upon him to refute it.

It



IT may also be here consider'd by the way, whether he has had reason to call absurd the notion I instanc'd touching light, when I said our conceptions about it every morning are not under the idea of a body or accident, or motion of air, but under the idea of a thing which serves us and leads us forth to labour. And this I think is the sense of the greatest part of the world, and perhaps of Mr. *Arnaud* too if he would speak his mind, there being few persons who think when the day begins to appear, or withdraw, of conceiving the light under the notions which Philosophy offers, be they what they will. At least I have the anonymous Author of the Discourse containing several reflections on the modern Philosophy of Mr. *Des Cartes* on my side, for he freely acknowledges, *That this idea is such in effect as Mr. Claude supposes it in every workman, just as the workman says, that when the light of the day fails him, he had rather have the light of the Lamp than that of the Candle, for this or that kind of work.*

## CHAP. III.

*A Defence of the second, third, and fourth Rank of persons against the Objections of Mr. Arnaud.*

**T**HE first rank of persons being defended against Mr. *Arnaud's* subtilties, it now concerns us to examin his Objections against the three others, but to do it with greater brevity: I shall not trouble my self with his useles words, but as to matters of moment I shall not pass by any of 'em.

THE second rank is of those that proceeded so far as the question, *how this visible Bread, this subject called Sacrament, is the Body of Jesus Christ; but finding an inconsistency in the terms, their minds settled on the only difficulty without undertaking to solve it.*

Mr. *ARNAUD* says, *That the Fathers have not known these kind of people*; he means they have not mention'd them in their Writings. But sup-<sup>Lib. 6. c. 7. pag. 575.</sup> posing the Fathers never knew 'em, does Mr. *Arnaud* believe the Fathers must needs know or expound all the several manners of taking things, which were practis'd by all particular persons? Had they nothing else to do but to make general inventories of mens fancies, to find out and denote distinctly the strength or weakness of each individual person. If he imagins 'tis a sufficient reason to affirm there were not any persons in the ancient Church, who finding great difficulty in this proposition, that the Bread is the Body of Jesus Christ, stuck here without undertaking to clear the point, to say the Fathers have known none of this kind, he must acknowledg at the same time that there were none likewise that took these words in this sense, That the substance of Bread is chang'd into the substance of the Body of Jesus Christ. For I maintain that the Fathers have not known any of these kind of people, never spake of 'em, never offer'd 'em as an example to doubters, nor declared that this was the true sense of their expressions. Neither can it be answer'd, that if they have not mention'd 'em, 'twas because all the

T t t

Faith-

Lib. 6. ch. 1.  
p. 529.

Faithful took them in this sense. For Mr. Arnaud confesses himself, *'Tis probable that the belief of the Faithful has been ever clear and distinct on the subject of the Real Presence, and that they have ever known whether what was given them was or was not the Body of Jesus Christ, altho they knew not always so expressly and universally whether the Bread did or did not remain in the Sacrament.* Any man may see what means such an acknowledgment from Mr. Arnaud, I repeat it here again, that 'tis possible the Faithful did not always so expressly and universally know whether the Bread remains or not in the Sacrament, which is without doubt at this time a very considerable acknowledgment. But not to extend it further than the terms will bear, we may at least conclude thence that the Fathers ought to suppose there were persons who probably would not take these words, *The Bread is the Body of Jesus Christ*, in this sense, *The substance of the Bread is changed into the substance of the Body of Jesus Christ*: and hereupon may be askt why they have not observ'd the exactness and quickness of understanding in the one, to deliver the rest from the ignorance wherein Mr. Arnaud acknowledges they may have been.

Serm. ad inf.  
Theophyl. in  
Joan. 6.

AGAIN, who told Mr. Arnaud that the Fathers knew not at least in general there might be persons who met with difficulty in this question, *How the Bread can be the Body of Jesus Christ*, because of the inconsistency of the terms of *Bread* and *Body*? This is the difficulty S. Austin proposes in express terms on behalf of persons newly Baptiz'd, in a Sermon he preach'd to 'em. *How*, says he, *is the Bread his Body, and the Wine his Blood?* The same difficulty is proposed by Theophylact, *Let no body be troubled*, says he, *that he must believe Bread to be Flesh.* This was the difficulty which the Fathers were willing to prevent or resolve by this great number of passages which explain in what sense we must understand the Bread to be the Body of Jesus Christ, to wit, because 'tis the Symbol of it, the sign or figure, the Sacrament of it, because there's some kind of proportion between Bread and Body, &c. as I shew'd in my Answer to the Author of the *Perpetuity*. Now what were all these explications for but to help those that were perplex with these ways of speaking, *The Bread is the Body of Jesus Christ*, *the Bread is made the Body of Jesus Christ*, and who for want of such assistance might make thereof a rock of offence.

Lib. 6. cap. 7.  
p. 575.

NEITHER need Mr. Arnaud make so many exclamations, *How should those people discern the Body of our Saviour, who were not solicitous to know him, and that the Eucharist bore its name? What Devotion could they have for this mystery, seeing Devotion supposes Instruction?* Altho they knew not how 'twas meant the Bread was the Body, yet did not this hinder 'em from having a respect for our Saviour's Body, from having a real Devotion, considering that our Lord was dead and risen for 'em, unless according to Mr. Arnaud it be no real Devotion to meditate on the Death and Resurrection of Christ. Neither did this hinder 'em from receiving with great respect the Bread and Wine, as pledges and remembrances of our Lords Body and Blood. For 'tis not impossible for persons to know the Eucharist to be a remembrance of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, and that also the Bread and Wine are said to be the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, without knowing that the first of these expressions is the cause of the second, which is to say, that the Bread and Wine are said to be this Body and Blood, because they are the memorials and pledges of it.

But

BUT, says Mr. Arnaud, *This laziness which makes the character of this* Page 576.  
*second order,* would last their whole life, and not only some little space of  
 time. That it would do so, we never told Mr. Arnaud, 'tis his addition.  
 'Twas a laziness in a matter of the greatest concernment. I confess 'tis very  
 important to make a good use of the Sacrament, which is what I suppose  
 these persons did; but when a man shall find difficulty in knowing how the  
 Bread is the Body of Jesus Christ, and knows not how to solve it, we must  
 not therefore despair of his salvation. *This,* says he again, *is a laziness*  
*from which a man may be freed by the least question offer'd to a Priest or Laick*  
*that is knowing, by the instructions which the Pastors gave to those that were*  
*admitted to the Communion; and by those they every day gave to the people*  
*concerning this mystery.* 'Tis true they might be freed from it by a thou-  
 sand expressions of the Fathers, which denoted the Bread and Wine are  
 called the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ by an exchange of names  
 which is made between the signs and the things signifi'd. But we are not  
 wont to do every thing immediately which we can do; and 'tis not to be  
 deny'd but several were freed from it by this means; but this does not hin-  
 der but that we may reasonably conceive a rank of persons who had not of  
 'emself sufficient knowledge to clear this difficulty.

Mr. ARNAUD earnestly demands of us, *Why these people did not* Page 577, 578.  
*understand the Bread to be the Body of Jesus Christ in a sense of Transubstan-*  
*tiation, or in a sense of Consubstantiation, rather than to take them in this*  
*sense, that the Bread remaining Bread was the Body of Jesus Christ; seeing*  
*the sense of Transubstantiation has been follow'd by all Christians since six hun-*  
*dred years; and that of Consubstantiation has been embraced by the Luther-*  
*ans: whereas the last sense has been follow'd by no body, and as yet never en-*  
*tered into any mans thoughts.* I answer in two words, 'twas because neither  
 Transubstantiation, nor Consubstantiation were then found out, and that  
 these persons we speak of had not Philosophy enough to invent 'em them-  
 selves. They follow'd nature, which will not suffer us to take otherwise  
 this proposition, if we understand it literally, than by conceiving the ordi-  
 nary idea of real Bread, and the common notion of a real Body; that is to  
 say two inconsistent ideas. Moreover, not to insist upon what Mr. Arnaud  
 says, that the sense of Transubstantiation has been follow'd by all Christians  
 for this six hundred years; after what has been seen hitherto we may judg  
 what truth there is in this proposition. Neither do I at present mind what  
 he says, that the last sense has been follow'd by no body: this is as little true  
 as the rest. Rupert held the assumption of the Bread, John of Paris has  
 openly asserted it; not to mention here that the true opinion of the Greek  
 Church since Damascen is, that the Bread remaining Bread is the Body of  
 Jesus Christ by the union of the Divinity, and by way of augmentation of  
 the Body of Jesus Christ. But when there's occasion to deny or affirm  
 things, Mr. Arnaud is always at his liberty.

I SAID that these persons of the second rank of whom we now speak,  
 finding great inconsistency in these terms, *Bread and Body of Jesus Christ,*  
 found no sense in this proposition, *The Bread is the Body of Jesus Christ,* and  
 that it appear'd to them unintelligible. Mr. Arnaud says hereupon, *That*  
*when two inconsistent notions are affirmed one of another, we learn three things.*  
 1. *These two notions affirm'd, that is to say, the notion of each one of the*  
*terms.* 2. *The affirmation which is made of 'em.* 3. *The falsity and impos-*



sibility of this affirmation, and that if this proposition is of a person to whom we cannot attribute a falsity, we have a fourth knowledg, which is, that this impossible affirmation is not the sense which the Author of the proposition had in his mind. I grant this. But I grant not the consequence he would draw hence, that one knows an inconsistent sense; for that which he calls an inconsistent sense is not a sense. We know an inconsistency, a mutual repugnancy of terms which cannot be reconcil'd; but we do not conceive a sense. Mr. Arnaud says, *That this Philosophy surpasses his understanding, and seems to him to contain a manifest falsity.* We must then endeavour to explain it to him, and make him acknowledg the truth of it. And for this effect it must be supposed that we speak here of an affirmative proposition, *The Bread is the Body of Jesus Christ*; that we speak of persons who respected the three terms of which this proposition consists, according to their literal signification, conceiving the common idea of *Bread*, the common idea of a human Body, and taking the term *est* in a sense of being real. This being supposed, I say, that in respect of an affirmative proposition, a sense is a notion which unites two ideas, and in which a mans mind may acquiesce, either in deceiving or not deceiving it self; if it be not deceiv'd, 'tis a real sense, if it be 'tis a false sense. The knowledg of an inconsistency is on the contrary a notion that so separates two ideas, that it makes them oppose and overthrow one another, and declares them irreconcilable. Now 'tis not to be imagin'd that a man can reconcile in his mind two ideas which his understanding judges to be absolutely repugnant. To conceive a sense, is to conceive a thing possible, to conceive an inconsistency is to conceive that there is therein an impossibility; to conceive a sense is to conceive a state wherein the mind or understanding may subsist; whereas to conceive an inconsistency, is to conceive that there is not there a state wherein the mind can subsist. It is then certain, as I said, that an inconsistency is not a sense, and that 'tis to speak abusively to say an inconsistent sense; for this is as much as to say a sense which is not a sense, a sense is a notion which unites two ideas, and an inconsistency disunites them. All Mr. Claudes subtilty, or rather deceit, says Mr. Arnaud, lies in that he does not distinguish between a conceiv'd and an expressed sense, and a sense believ'd and approv'd of. 'Tis certain that those who find a proposition includes an inconsistency according to the letter, and see no other sense therein, do approve no other; but 'tis not true that they conceive no other sense therein, for they conceive an inconsistent sense, which is to say, that they conceive only inconsistent terms are therein affirmed, and therefore disapprove of 'em, and conclude from the inconsistency of this sense, that this is not the sense of the proposition of the Scripture and the Church.

Page 180.

BUT Mr. Arnaud's Philosophy has given here a false stroke; for, for to say that a man conceives an inconsistent sense, is to speak absurdly. We must distinguish between those that offer an inconsistent proposition, and those that judg it inconsistent. Those that offer it, do not always see the inconsistency of the terms, either because they conceive them under respects wherein th' inconsistency does not discover it self, or because they conceive them confusedly, and in such a manner wherein they hide from themselves the contradiction, and then those that judg of their proposition enter into their thoughts, and conceive the sense which the others have imagin'd to be possible, altho in effect it be not. They suspend a while their own judgments, to put themselves in the place of others, and by this means conceive this apparent possibility which has deceiv'd them. But this is not

to conceive an inconsistent sense, but on the contrary a sense that appears consistent and reasonable to abused persons, altho at bottom it be otherwise. Whilst a man judges of it according to the false lights of these persons, he calls it a sense, because his mind acquiesces therein, as seeing nothing therein impossible, but as soon as he judges of it upon th' account of th' inconsistency of the terms, 'tis no longer a sense, 'tis a mere contradiction that has no sense, and which is unintelligible. I confess, that as mens minds are subject to fearful capricio's, it sometimes happens that they advance propositions, wherein contradictions are so evident that they must needs have seen 'em themselves: such as is that of this Philosopher mention'd by Mr. Arnaud, who affirmed, *That if God pleas'd, two and two should not be four*: but in this case 'tis requisite to say that these persons impose on the world, and understand not themselves what they say. For, for to say that a man can make to himself a sense of a contradiction, 'when it appears to him to be a contradiction, that he can unite two ideas, by affirming one of the other at the same time, wherein he sees they cannot be accorded; that is to say, that he can persuade himself that a thing is possible, ev'n then when it seems to him to be impossible. If this be Mr. Arnaud's Philosophy, he must Philosophise by himself for me.

'TIS then clear, I had reason to say, that this second rank of persons, which I supposed in the ancient Church, who found inconsistency in the terms of this proposition, *The Bread is the Body of Jesus Christ*, conceiv'd properly no sense at all in it. For as to their parts they could not find any in it, seeing the proposition to them seem'd inconsistent. Neither could their Pastors help 'em, seeing 'tis laid down for a maxim, that they knew not in what sense the Fathers understood it. But, says Mr. Arnaud, *not knowing any other way to make the Eucharist to be the Body of Jesus Christ, they must make an entire separation of the Bread and Body, and absolutely deny the presence and existence of Jesus Christ in the Bread, which is rejecting the Real Presence.* I answer that this is not a good conclusion, the persons of which we speak found no sense in the proposition, *The Bread is the Body of Jesus Christ*, the two ideas of *Bread* and *Body* appeared to them inconsistent, they knew no other means of making the Bread to be the Body, I grant, but seeing 'twas a proposition of their Pastors, whom they would not charge with falsity; and being taught it as from the authority of Jesus Christ himself, 'tis not to be doubted but they acknowledg'd in general that it must have a good sense, altho they knew not which was this good sense; and therefore I said in my answer to the Perpetuity, that *their minds stop'd at the only difficulty, without undertaking to resolve it.* 'Tis fruitless to enquire whether they rejected by a positive judgment the unity of these two substances *Bread* and *Body*, or whether their minds hung in suspense, notwithstanding what appear'd to 'em from th' inconsistency of the terms. I have not attributed to them this rejection, as Mr. Arnaud says I have, in impertinently transferring what I said of them, who went as far as the Sacramental sense, to those of this second rank, who proceeded not so far. But whether they formally rejected this unity of two substances, or only suspended their judgments, it is clear they neither rejected Transubstantiation, nor Consubstantiation; for neither one nor the other of these two opinions establishes th' unity of these two substances *Bread* and *Body*, in the sense we understand it here, that is to say, by affirming that the Bread remaining Bread is the Body of Jesus Christ. They may have deny'd the Real Presence in this last sense, that is to say, judged that the Bread remaining Bread, cannot be the Body

Body of Jesus Christ; but as to other ways since found out to make the Bread to be the Body, having no knowledge of 'em, they could not reject them. They rejected (if you will) the unity of the two substances, they conceived no sense in this expression, the Bread is the Body of Jesus Christ; yet they acknowledg'd it must have a good and a true one, altho they knew not in particular which that was, they carry'd off their minds from this difficulty, but in all this they conceiv'd no distinct notice either of Transubstantiation or Consubstantiation.

Page 583.

IN vain does Mr. Arnaud endeavour to persuade us, *That the natural idea of these words, The Bread is the Body of Jesus Christ, in explaining them in the usual manner was, that appearing Bread 'twas not so, but the very Body of Jesus Christ, and that 'tis a renouncing all the lights of reason to pretend that this so common, true, and authoriz'd sense by custom never entred into the thoughts of any man during eight hundred years.* All this signifies nothing, seeing his pretended sense is contrary to nature, the question concerning Bread which a man seeth, and which all the notices of sense and reason assure to be Bread, these same notices do not inform us that 'tis not Bread, or that 'tis only an appearance of it. The question likewise concerning a Body which we know is in Heaven, and which is like unto that which we have, the notices of reason urge not a man to understand that this Body is there under the appearance of Bread. So that should we suppose that during eight hundred years this sense entred not into any bodies thoughts, we shall suppose nothing but what's very natural and reasonable. *But, says Mr. Arnaud, when Raphael led young Toby, if any one that knew who he was should say, this Man whom you see is an Angel, Toby would not have imagin'd that he was both Man and Angel too; but easily conceive he meant only, that appearing Man he was really an Angel.* But does not Mr. Arnaud consider that this example is quite different from our case? When the Angels appear'd under the form of men, there was always some sensible character that distinguish'd them, and easily shew'd there was something more than natural in 'em. There's nothing like this in the Bread, th' apparition of Angels in a humane shape, was very frequent under the old Testament, and Toby was instructed in his infancy in the belief of this. This apparition of the Body of Jesus Christ under the form of Bread was unheard of in the Church. We know that an Angel leaves Heaven, when he comes to appear on Earth in a humane shape; whereas we know on the contrary that the Body of Jesus Christ is so in Heaven that it will not leave that place till the last Judgment. We know an Angel is of a spiritual nature, and a man consults not his eyes to know whether he is present or not; but we know that the Body of Jesus Christ is of a sensible nature, th' object of our sight and feeling. Had then any one said to Toby, *This man whom you see is an Angel,* perhaps Toby had taken this proposition in Mr. Arnaud's sense, because he would have been led to it, by what I now come from representing touching th' appearance of Angels. But suppose as we ought to suppose in this place of our dispute a man that knows not as yet the Doctrin of Transubstantiation, nor that of Consubstantiation; that knows not the Principles of it, that never heard of it, nor of an appearance of Bread without its substance, nor of a humane Body, impalpable, invisible, and existent in several places at a time; and moreover, knows that the Body of Jesus Christ is in Heaven. Let this man be told the Bread is the Body of Jesus Christ, 'tis certain that the light of reason will never lead him to this violent explication, *That that which appears Bread, and is not, is the very Body of Jesus Christ in substance.*

Page 582.



stance. As to the rest, Mr. Arnaud ought not to abuse several passages of Calvin, Beza, and Zuinglius disputing against those called Lutherans. Their sense is, that if these words, *this is my Body*, may be literally understood, we must rather admit the sense of the Roman Church than that of the Lutherans. But it does not hence follow that the sense of the Roman Church is the most natural one, nor that the people must find it of themselves; this consequence does not any ways follow.

SO that here are two of the ranks of persons which I asserted delivered from the unjust pursuits of Mr. Arnaud: *The third*, says he, *is less troublesome than the others.* Why? *Because*, adds he, *it consists only of persons that believed the Real Presence, and had a distinct Faith of it.* This rank is of those, who going as far as the question; *How the Sacrament is the Body of Jesus Christ?* proceeded also to the solution of it; but their minds stopt at general terms, as that *Jesus Christ is present to us in the Sacrament, and that we receive therein his Body and Blood without searching a greater light.* 'Tis certain, says Mr. Arnaud, *there might be in effect faithful persons in the ancient Church that penetrated no farther into this Mystery than barely to believe that Jesus Christ is therein present, and that we receive therein his Body and Blood.* God be praised that we have at length once said something which Mr. Arnaud does not contradict. And to return him the same kindness do tell him, that what he grants here does not at all displease me. For this plainly shews there were faithful people in the ancient Church that knew nothing of Transubstantiation, but conceiv'd only a Presence of Jesus Christ in the Sacrament, and a reception of his Body and Blood under a general notion: yet Mr. Arnaud pretends that this notion, how general soever it might be, was distinctly the Real Presence. Which is what I deny, and must examin. The question is then only whether these persons believ'd distinctly the Real Presence, he pretends it and I deny it.

*THEY* knew, says Mr. Arnaud, *neither the key of Figure, nor the key of* Page 587.  
*Virtue, according to the Hypothesis it self.* So that neither the presence of *Virtue*, nor the presence of *figure* came into their thoughts. I grant it. *What presence then could they conceive but the Real Presence, but the Real Reception?* And why must they have given to these words another sense than that which they naturally have? This is ill concluded. They would have conceiv'd a confus'd and general idea of Presence without descending to a particular and precise distinction. I confess 'tis very hard for persons that have their sight, and never so little of common sense, not to acknowledg that the Body of Jesus Christ is not in the Eucharist in this ordinary and corporeal manner, by which a body is naturally in one place: and I am sufficiently persuaded that those persons in question could not come so far as to enquire how the Eucharist is the Body of Jesus Christ, without conceiving the idea of his visible and sensible Presence to reject it: but we shall suppose nothing that is unreasonable, in saying that in carrying off their thoughts from this corporeal Existence, they conceiv'd it present under a very confused notion; for 'tis a usual thing with persons that are unlearned, to consider things in a confused manner; and therefore we commonly see they cannot express themselves otherwise than in certain obscure and general terms, which do never well shew what they have in their minds. It cannot be deny'd but this kind of confused ideas are usual among people. But Mr. Arnaud must not imagin that these persons of whom we speak believed the substantial Presence of the Body of Jesus Christ in the Sacrament, for re-  
jecting

jecting the idea of the corporal Presence, as 'tis likely they did by the very instinct of nature, to maintain they believ'd a substantial Presence, we must suppose either that they had the idea of another manner of substantial presence of a body than the corporeal one, or at least that they knew there was some other which was not less a substantial Presence than the corporeal one, altho they knew it not. Now of these two suppositions the first is acknowledged to be false by Mr. Arnaud himself, and the second is wholly contrary to reason; for who should inform them there was another manner of a substantial presence of a body than a corporeal one? Nature shews us no other, the expressions of their Pastors mention'd no other; whence then must they have it? It must then be said they had a confused idea of another manner of presence than the substantial one, they beheld it in the expressions of their Pastors, felt it in the motions of their Consciences; but to denote precisely what that was, was what they could not otherwise do than by general terms of presence, reception, and such like. Now this was in effect to believe not a substantial Presence, but a Presence of union, a Presence of salutary efficacy, in reference to the Soul, altho they comprehended it not in its full distinction.

THE fourth rank is of those who after they had been puzzled with the inconsistency of the terms of Bread and Body of Jesus Christ, found the real knot of this difficulty, to wit, that the Bread is the Sacrament, the memorial and pledg of the holy Body of our Redeemer. They found it, says Mr. Arnaud, because it pleases Mr. Claude to suppose so, but 'twas after a long search. My supposition contains nothing but what we see happens every day in the world. 'Tis certain there are persons who be full of doubts, this is no wonder, and we find 'em not so easily freed from them; they esteem themselves happy when after a long search they get them resolved. What extraordinary matter is there then in this supposition.

BUT whilst they were in search of it, and could not find it, adds Mr. Arnaud, dares Mr. Claude say their minds were not smitten with any idea of the Real Presence by all the passages and instructions of the Fathers. They never knew of any key of Virtue, or Figure, how then understood they the words of the Fathers which assured them that the Lamb of God is present on the Eucharistical Table; that the Bread appearing Bread was not so, but the Body of Jesus Christ; that we drink the immortal Blood of Jesus Christ; that the Blood of Jesus Christ is added to ours; that it enters into us; that this single Body, which is distributed to so many thousands is entire in each of 'em; that 'tis the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ in truth; that we must not doubt of it, seeing he has said so himself; that altho what we see has nothing like to a human body, yet none refuse to believe what Christ himself has asserted to be true; that the Bread is changed into the very Body of Jesus Christ; that the Bread is made the Body of Jesus Christ by the ineffable operation of the Holy Spirit; that we must not look for the usual course of nature in the Body of Jesus Christ. Mr. Claude cannot defend himself from these passages, but by applying to 'em his keys of Virtue and Figure, and enduring a thousand vexatious oppositions. Now these persons being strangers to these inventions, conceived the literal idea of these words, they conceived that Jesus Christ entred into us, that 'twas not Bread, but the Body of Jesus Christ, that 'twas not to be question'd; that they ought to give their senses the lye: and thus during all the time of this search, they had mangre Mr. Claude, the Real Presence still in their minds.

TO make this arguing good, there must be several things supposed, which Mr. *Arnaud* himself will not approve to be reasonable. First, we must suppose that those of this fourth rank now in question, had either heard a great part of the Fathers preach, which the Roman Church alledges in her own favour as well Greeks as Latins of several Ages, or read almost all their Writings concerning the Eucharist; for what Mr. *Arnaud* now recited to us is a rhapsody of several expressions to be found here and there in *Gelasius of Cyzique*, *Cyril of Jerusalem*, *Chrysostom*; *Cyril of Alexandria*, *Gregory of Nyssa*, *Hesychius*, *Gaudencius*, *Epiphany*, *Damasceus* and *Ambrose*. Secondly, We must suppose they made an exact collection of all these expressions of the Fathers which Mr. *Arnaud* abuses, and put them altogether to make a better survey of them, and grounded thereupon their difficulty. Thirdly, We must suppose that those of this fourth rank did all the same thing, or at least, communicated this rhapsody to one another, to behold therein all of 'em the Real Presence during the time of their doubting. Fourthly, We must suppose they took care to collect nothing that might carry off their minds from the Real Presence, or offer 'em contrary objects.

LET Mr. *Arnaud* consider, if he pleases, that those of this fourth rank now in question are a middle sort of people, whom we suppose to be persons of small reading, or study, who were not capable of making either for themselves or fellows, collections of difficult passages, but only heard their Pastors say that the Bread of the Eucharist is the Body of Jesus Christ, or is made the Body of Jesus Christ. For when we suppose persons that knew all these expressions of the Fathers proposed by Mr. *Arnaud*, and that have collected 'em, 'twill be just to suppose likewise they were not ignorant that the Fathers taught also, *That what we see on the Altar is Bread and Wine, creatures and fruits of the Earth; that they are signs and mystical symbols of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ; that these symbols leave not their own nature, but remain in their first substance; that our Saviour Christ has honored them with the name of his Body and Blood, not in changing their nature, but in adding grace to their nature; that Jesus Christ as he is God is everywhere, but as Man is in Heaven; that his Body must be in one place; that when his Flesh was on Earth it was not in Heaven, and that being now in Heaven, it is not certainly upon Earth; that the Bread is not properly his Body, nor the Wine his Blood, but so call'd, inasmuch as they contain the mystery of 'em; that our Saviour has made an exchange of names, having given to his Body the name of Symbol; that he has called the Bread his Body, to the end we might know that he whose Body the Prophet had anciently figured by Bread, has now given to Bread the figure of his Body.* By this means when Mr. *Arnaud* pretends the former passages gave the idea of a Real Presence, I may pretend likewise that these last mention'd carried the same persons off from it, and led 'em to a Sacramental sense. But as I said, it is not needful to put them of this fourth rank upon collecting passages out of the Fathers on either hand, seeing we suppose they were only meanly instructed in points of Religion.

TO finish this Chapter, and the defence of the second, third, and fourth ranks of persons which I supposed were in the ancient Church, we have only to answer in few words an objection which Mr. *Arnaud* has proposed in his tenth Chapter, which respects these three ranks in general; I mean the second, third, and fourth: which objection consists in this, *That there being two sorts of doubts, the one in which a man understands and conceives a thing;*

U u u

but



but knows not whether it be or be not, whether 'tis possible or impossible; as when a man doubts whether Beasts think, whether our blood circulates in the body; others wherein a man knows not what makes the doubt; as when one doubts of the causes of the flux and reflux of the Sea, or of the sense of a passage of Scripture, when the sense which appears is false, and yet a man sees no other: there is this difference between these two ways of doubting that in the first, there's no need to have the thing explained to us, 'tis sufficient we have proofs given us of it. But the second which includes an ignorance of the manner, necessarily requires an explication. That the doubt or ignorance which Mr. Claude attributes to three of the ranks, which compose his system, is of this second kind, that is to say one of these doubts which have need of information and explication of the manner of the thing, being the persons in question were offended at the inconsistency of these terms, Bread and Body, and knew not how it could be true, that the Bread was the Body of Jesus Christ, or chang'd into the Body of Jesus Christ; so that their ignorance could not be cured, but by shewing 'em the manner in which the Bread might be the Body of Jesus Christ, to wit, in Figure and Virtue. In the mean time the doubt against which the Fathers have pretended to fortify the Faithful is removed by the same Fathers by confirming and several times repeating that the Eucharist is the Body of Jesus Christ without the addition of an explication of Figure, or Virtue. Whence it follows, that the doubt they would take away is not in any wise that which Mr. Claude attributes to three of his ranks. For his doubt requires not proofs but illustrations, that is to say, the question is not to prove the Eucharist to be the Body of Jesus Christ, but to explain in what sense this is true. Now in all the passages of the Fathers wherein they mention a doubt, they are only solicitous to prove that the Eucharist is the Body of Jesus Christ, without any elucidation; and they prove it by these words, *Hoc est corpus meum*: or by these, *Panis quem ego dabo caro mea est*, or by the divers examples of the Power of God, the Creation of the world, the Miracles of the Prophets, and by that of the Incarnation.

I PRETEND not to examin here all the parts of this discourse, 'twill be sufficient to make some remarks which will clearly discover the impertinency of it. First, The division Mr. Arnaud makes of the doubts is insufficient for the subject we are upon; for he should again subdivide into two, the second kind of doubt, and say that sometimes those that doubt in being ignorant of the causes or manner of the thing, yet do nevertheless acknowledge the truth of the thing it self, and hold it for certain, altho they know not how it is. Thus when a man doubts of the causes of the flux, or reflux of the Sea, he yet believes that this flux and reflux is true. When Divines doubt of the manner after which God knows contingent matters, this hinders 'em not from believing he knows them; and when they doubt concerning the manner in which the three persons exist, in one and the same essence, this does not hinder them from believing that they do exist. But sometimes the ignorance of the manner makes people doubt of the truth of the thing it self. Thus Nestorius not being able to comprehend how the two Natures make but one Person in Jesus Christ, doubted of this truth, that there were in Jesus Christ two Natures and one Person; and not only doubted of it, but deny'd it. Thus Pelagius, because he could not understand how Grace operates inwardly on the hearts of the Faithful rejected this operation. We may call this first doubt a doubt proceeding from mere ignorance, and the second a doubt of incredulity. Secondly, Mr. Arnaud takes no notice that the doubt which arises from the inconsistency of these terms,

terms, *Bread and Body*, so far prevail'd in the minds of some, as to make 'em doubt of the truth it self of these words. How can this be, said they, seeing we see Bread and Wine, and not Flesh and Blood, *Who will doubt,* Cyril Hieros. says Cyril of Jerusalem, and say, 'tis not his Blood? *You will tell me,* per- Catuch. myst. 1. haps, says the Author of the Book, *De Initiatis*, I see quite another thing, how will you persuade me I receive the Body of Jesus Christ. And the same kind of doubt we have observ'd among the Greeks of the 11th. Century in Theophylact, *Quomodo inquit? caro non videtur:* and in the 12th. in Nicolas Methoniensis; for he entitles his Book, *Against those that doubt and say the Consecrated Bread and Wine are not the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ.* Perhaps, says he, you doubt, and do not believe, because you see not Flesh and Blood, but Bread and Wine. Thirdly, Mr. Arnaud takes notice, that when we have to do with these kind of doubters, who will not acknowledg the truth of the thing it self, because they are ignorant of the manner of it, we usually take several ways to persuade them; sometimes we confirm the thing it self, without expounding to 'em the manner, altho it be the ignorance of the manner which makes them doubt of the thing. Thus our Saviour seeing the doubt of the Capernaits, *How can he give us his flesh to eat?* did not set about explaining the manner of this manducation to 'em, but opposes 'em by a reiterated affirmation of what he had told 'em. *Verily, verily,* says he, *if you eat not the Flesh of the Son of man and drink his Blood, you will have no life in you, &c.* Sometimes the explication of the thing and the manner of it are joyn'd together; and thus our Saviour dealt with the doubt of Nicodemus, *How can a man be born when he is old; can he enter again into his Mothers womb and be born?* *Verily, verily,* says our Saviour, *I say unto you, unless a man be born of Water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God.* These words do at the same time both confirm and explain. But when we have to do with doubters that are only ignorant of the manner without calling into question the truth of the thing, then we usually explain only the manner without confirming any more the thing, because this alone is sufficient to instruct them; and 'tis thus the Angel bespeaks the Virgin: *How, said she, can this be, for I know not a man?* *The Holy Spirit,* says he, *shall come upon thee, and the virtue of the most high shall overshadow thee; therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee, shall be called the Son of God.*

TO apply these things to the present occasion, I say the Fathers had to do with two sorts of Doubters; the one who were only ignorant of the manner, *how the Bread is, or is made the Body of Jesus Christ?* but yet who held the proposition to be true, altho they knew not the sense of it: and they are those that make up the third, second, and fourth ranks in my Answer to the *Perpetuity*: others who went so far as to call in question the truth of the proposition under pretence they understood not the manner of it. As to these last, supposing the Fathers contented themselves with sometimes confirming their proposition by the words of Jesus Christ, who is Truth it self, it must not be thought strange; the nature of the doubt led 'em to this: yet is it true they have always added to the confirmation of the thing, the explication of the manner, as may be apparently justifi'd by several passages which we have elsewhere cited. But when they had only to do with the first sort of Doubters, then they contented themselves with explaining the manner, without pressing the truth of the words. Thus does S. Austin, (after he had propos'd the doubt of those that were newly Baptiz'd, *How is the Bread his Body, and the Wine his Blood?*) make this an-

*Serm. ad inf.* Iwer, My Brethren, these things are called Sacraments, because that which we see is one thing, and that which we hear another; what we see has corporeal species, but what we hear has a spiritual fruit. To this end do all the passages of the Fathers tend which declare how the Bread is the Body of Jesus Christ, to wit, or because 'tis the Sacrament of it, the sign and figure, or because it stands for it, or because it communicates it to us; or because Christ changes it into the efficacy of his Flesh; and those which term it the typical Body, the symbolical Body, the mystical Body, and those that attribute to the words of Christ a Sacramental or figurative sense; for these are as so many explications of the manner which serve to clear up the doubt in question.

Mr. ARNAUD's illusion then is a double one; for on one hand what ought to be referred to one kind of doubt, he refers to another: what refers to the doubt of incredulity which respects the truth of the words, he refers to the simple doubt of ignorance which consists only in not knowing the manner how the Bread is the Body of Jesus Christ: and this illusion is grounded on the imperfect division which he has made of the doubts. On the other hand he suppresses whatsoever the Fathers have said in order to th' explaining in what sense the Sacrament is the Body of Jesus Christ, and offers only what they have said to confirm that it is so. As to the passages he proposes, he shews but small sincerity in telling us the Fathers add no explication of figure or virtue; for the greatest part of those he alledges speak either of the Type, or Figure, or Sacrament, or spiritual Understanding, or Virtue. Cyril of Jerusalem speaks of the type of Bread, and of the type of Wine. The Author of the Treatise *De Initiatis* concludes that 'tis the Sacrament of the Flesh of Jesus Christ. Gaudencius says, That the Bread is the figure of the Body of Jesus Christ. Chrysostom says that God gives us in the Sacrament the intelligible or spiritual things by means of sensible. And Hesychius recommends to our consideration the virtue of the Mystery, and spiritual understanding of it.

#### CHAP. IV.

##### *Defence of the Fifth Rank against the Objections of Mr. Arnaud.*

THE fifth rank of persons which I supposed were in the ancient Church was of those that at the hearing of these propositions the Bread is the Body of Jesus Christ, the Bread is chang'd into the Body of Jesus Christ, the Bread is made the Body of Jesus Christ, proceeded immediately to their true and natural sense, without perplexity or difficulty, and without considering the inconsistency of the terms, very well understanding that the Bread remaining Bread is consecrated to be to us a Sacrament which imparts to us our Lord's Body, and these had a more clear and distinct knowledge of the truth, and an apprehension better fitted to understand the style and common expressions of the Church.

Mr. ARNAUD spends all the 11th. Chapter of his sixth Book to shew that these persons, whom I suppose had necessarily before their eyes a distinct



a distinct idea of the Real Presence. Which is what he endeavours to prove: First, By the example of this infinite number of Christians which were found to hold in the beginning of the 11th. Century the belief of the Real Presence, and who had taken up this Faith from the same expressions of the Fathers which ever rung in the ears of the Faithful of the first eight Centuries; whence it without doubt follows that these expressions which have persuaded the whole world into the belief of the Real Presence, might well give the idea of it to those which preceded them. Secondly, He offers the double idea which the metaphorical terms offer to the mind, for they offer, says he, to the mind that which one would have it understand, and shew it at the same time the image by which one represents it. Thus this expression of Scripture, *Vicit Leo de tribu Juda*, puts us upon thinking that Jesus Christ is compared to a Lion by reason of his strength; so that the word *Lion* forms at the same instant in the mind two ideas, that of the strength of Christ which is the natural idea of the thing conceiv'd as true, and which the Scripture would signifie, and the idea of a Lion which is the natural idea of the Word, but which is only the resemblance of the truth which the Scripture would make us conceive. It is easie, says he moreover, to conclude hence that when a man should take all the words of the Fathers which express the Real Presence for metaphorical ones, when one shall give 'em all the senses which the Ministers give them, and suppose that the Faithful of the fifth Rank were all of 'em born every whit as metaphorical as Aubertin was after he had corrupted his judgment by vain wranglings for thirty years space, when we should grant they had all an infused knowledge of 'em, and had 'em also as present as the first Principles, they could not but see the Real Presence in the expressions of the Fathers, either as the true idea which they would mark, or as the image of this idea, but an image so lively and sensible, and denoted by such a great number of expressions, that 'tis impossible but their mind must have been touch'd with 'em. Thirdly, Mr. Arnaud uses for the same design the example of other Ministers, *Who conceiv'd*, says he, *a literal sense in the passages produc'd by the Catholicks.* In fine he uses for this end the very passages of the Fathers, and especially one of S. Hilary, and another of Gregory of Nyssè. We shall answer in order these four pretended reasons.

AS to the first which is taken from th' example of the people of the 11th. Century, it is evidently ineffectual by means of two essential differences there are between these people, and those of the eight first Centuries. The first is, that the idea of the Real Presence, I mean of that about which we dispute, was offered to those of the 11th. Century by the Disciples and followers of *Paschasius*, who maintain'd, and taught it, and applied thereunto the passages of the Fathers, dazzling the eyes of the world by false colours, and giving to these passages a sense which the people would never have discovered, had they been led by the light of nature. But there can be nothing said like this of the people of the eight first Centuries, to whom the idea of this substantial and invisible Presence was not yet discovered. They had not been taught it, nor were they told 'twas in this sense they must take the expressions of their Pastors. Moreover, the people of the 11th. Century had not the clear and easie passages of the Fathers proposed to 'em, which might give the true meaning of the Sacrament, and at the same time serve for an explication to the obscure expressions, and by this means shewing 'em only one side of the thing, and making 'em consider it in wrong circumstances, 'twas no hard matter for 'em to be deceiv'd, and take that for a Real Presence which was far from being it. But we must make another  
judg-

*Serm. ad inf.* swer, *My Brethren, these things are called Sacraments, because that which we see is one thing, and that which we hear another; what we see has corporeal species, but what we hear has a spiritual fruit.* To this end do all the passages of the Fathers tend which declare how the Bread is the Body of Jesus Christ, to wit, or because 'tis the Sacrament of it, the sign and figure, or because it stands for it, or because it communicates it to us, or because Christ changes it into the efficacy of his Flesh; and those which term it the typical Body, the symbolical Body, the mystical Body, and those that attribute to the words of Christ a Sacramental or figurative sense; for these are as so many explications of the manner which serve to clear up the doubt in question.

Mr. ARNAUD's illusion then is a double one; for on one hand what ought to be referred to one kind of doubt, he refers to another: what refers to the doubt of incredulity which respects the truth of the words, he refers to the simple doubt of ignorance which consists only in not knowing the manner how the Bread is the Body of Jesus Christ: and this illusion is grounded on the imperfect division which he has made of the doubts. On the other hand he suppresses whatsoever the Fathers have said in order to th' explaining in what sense the Sacrament is the Body of Jesus Christ, and offers only what they have said to confirm that it is so. As to the passages he proposes, he shews but small sincerity in telling us the Fathers add no explication of figure or virtue; for the greatest part of those he alledges speak either of the Type, or Figure, or Sacrament, or spiritual Understanding, or Virtue. Cyril of Jerusalem speaks of the type of Bread, and of the type of Wine. The Author of the Treatise *De Initiatis* concludes that 'tis the Sacrament of the Flesh of Jesus Christ. Gaudencius says, *That the Bread is the figure of the Body of Jesus Christ.* Chrysostom says that God gives us in the Sacrament the intelligible or spiritual things by means of sensible. And Hesychius recommends to our consideration the virtue of the Mystery, and spiritual understanding of it.

#### C H A P. IV.

##### *Defence of the Fifth Rank against the Objections of Mr. Arnaud.*

**T**HE fifth rank of persons which I supposed were in the ancient Church was of those *that at the hearing of these propositions the Bread is the Body of Jesus Christ, the Bread is chang'd into the Body of Jesus Christ, the Bread is made the Body of Jesus Christ, proceeded immediately to their true and natural sense, without perplexity or difficulty, and without considering the inconsistency of the terms, very well understanding that the Bread remaining Bread is consecrated to be to us a Sacrament which imparts to us our Lords Body, and these had a more clear and distinct knowledge of the truth, and an apprehension better fitted to understand the style and common expressions of the Church.*

Mr. ARNAUD spends all the 11th. Chapter of his sixth Book to shew that these persons, whom I suppose had necessarily before their eyes  
a distinct

a distinct idea of the Real Presence. Which is what he endeavours to prove. First, By the example of this infinite number of Christians which were found to hold in the beginning of the 11th. Century the belief of the Real Presence, and who had taken up this Faith from the same expressions of the Fathers which ever rung in the ears of the Faithful of the first eight Centuries; whence it without doubt follows that these expressions which have persuaded the whole world into the belief of the Real Presence, might well give the idea of it to those which preceded them. Secondly, He offers the double idea which the metaphorical terms offer to the mind, for they offer, says he, to the mind that which one would have it understand, and shew it at the same time the image by which one represents it. Thus this expression of Scripture, *Vicit Leo de tribu Juda*, puts us upon thinking that Jesus Christ is compared to a Lion by reason of his strength; so that the word *Lion* forms at the same instant in the mind two ideas, that of the strength of Christ which is the natural idea of the thing conceiv'd as true, and which the Scripture would signifie, and the idea of a Lion which is the natural idea of the Word, but which is only the resemblance of the truth which the Scripture would make us conceive. It is easie, says he moreover, to conclude hence that when a man should take all the words of the Fathers which express the Real Presence for metaphorical ones, when one shall give 'em all the senses which the Ministers give them, and suppose that the Faithful of the fifth Rank were all of 'em born every whit as metaphorical as Aubertin was after he had corrupted his judgment by vain wranglings for thirty years space, when we should grant they had all an infused knowledge of 'em, and had 'em also as present as the first Principles, they could not but see the Real Presence in the expressions of the Fathers, either as the true idea which they would mark, or as the image of this idea, but an image so lively and sensible, and denoted by such a great number of expressions, that 'tis impossible but their mind must have been touch'd with 'em. Thirdly, Mr. Arnaud uses for the same design the example of other Ministers, *Who conceiv'd*, says he, a literal sense in the passages produc'd by the Catholics. In fine he uses for this end the very passages of the Fathers, and especially one of S. Hilary, and another of Gregory of Nyssè. We shall answer in order these four pretended reasons.

AS to the first which is taken from th' example of the people of the 11th. Century, it is evidently ineffectual by means of two essential differences there are between these people, and those of the eight first Centuries. The first is, that the idea of the Real Presence, I mean of that about which we dispute, was offered to those of the 11th. Century by the Disciples and followers of *Paschasius*, who maintain'd, and taught it, and applied thereunto the passages of the Fathers, dazling the eyes of the world by false colours, and giving to these passages a sense which the people would never have discovered, had they been led by the light of nature. But there can be nothing said like this of the people of the eight first Centuries, to whom the idea of this substantial and invisible Presence was not yet discovered. They had not been taught it, nor were they told 'twas in this sense they must take the expressions of their Pastors. Moreover, the people of the 11th. Century had not the clear and easie passages of the Fathers proposed to 'em, which might give the true meaning of the Sacrament, and at the same time serve for an explication to the obscure expressions, and by this means shewing 'em only one side of the thing, and making 'em consider it in wrong circumstances, 'twas no hard matter for 'em to be deceiv'd, and take that for a Real Presence which was far from being it. But we must make another  
judg-



judgment of the eight first Centuries, wherein the Pastors instructing their flocks, gave them other ideas of this mystery, which carried them off from that of the invifible and incorporeal Presence.

We may in a manner apply the same answer to Mr. *Arnaud's* third reason, which is taken from the example of several Ministers, who altho they pretend that the true sense of the passages of the Fathers produc'd by those of the Roman Church, is the metaphorical one, yet do conceive the literal sense. For there is a great deal of difference between us and the people of the eight first Centuries. They lived in those times wherein the idea of the Real Presence, such as the Roman Church believes, was not discovered; whereas we live in those times wherein 'tis continually represented before our eyes. Both Rhetorick and Philosophy are set on work to shew it us in the Writings of the Fathers. 'Tis not possible then but entering into the sense of those that dispute incessantly against us, and putting our selves in their places to comprehend what they think, but we must conceive in the passages which they alledg to us, the sense of the Real Presence, altho we judg it to be false. 'Tis also true that they offer some to us under the name of the Fathers, which as Mr. *Daille* has well observ'd, seem in no wise to admit the sense of the Protestants. But these passages are of two kinds, for either they are falsly attributed to the Fathers, as is that denoted by Mr. *Daille*, *That the Bread changes its nature, and becomes by the Almighty Power of God the Flesh of the Word*, which he has consider'd as the words of S. *Cyprian*, under whose name they have been usually cited, whereas they are *Arnaud of Bonneval's*, an Author of the 12th. Century. As to such as these I confess 'tis not easie for Protestants to accommodate them to their sense, but very easie on the contrary to conceive the idea of the Real Presence in 'em; but this happens by their being regarded as the words of the Fathers, whereas indeed they be not. The others are really the sayings of the Fathers, but contain a particular sentiment, which is neither that of the Roman Church nor that of the Protestants; so that it cannot seem strange if those that would accommodate them to the sense of the Protestants found themselves perplexed with 'em; and such are several passages in *Gregory of Nyssè*, *Anastafius Sinaite*, and *Damascen*, which to speak properly, are neither for the Church of *Rome*, nor for us; I mean, do neither confirm our positive belief nor theirs, altho they alledg them in their own favour.

As to what Mr. *Arnaud* says touching the metaphors, I grant they do naturally form this double idea of which he speaks; but he is not ignorant there are, as I said, metaphorical terms, which use has made proper: so that they do not of themselves offer to the mind the natural idea which they signifie, but only the metaphorical one; unless a mans mind makes a particular reflection on them. Thus the term of House in Astrology, the term of *Aristotle* and *Plato* in a Library, and I know not how many others of this nature, do not present more to the mind than the idea of the things which they originally signifie. Let Mr. *Arnaud* call them as long as he will equivocal terms, dark metaphors which are abolish'd by use, this does not hinder the truth of my remark, nor th' application which I made of it to the terms of *Corpus*, *Corpus Domini*, *Corpus Christi*, which use had made so proper to the Sacrament, that they brought no other idea to the mind than that of the Sacrament, according as our senses represent it, without bringing in that of the natural Body of Jesus Christ. It is true, says Mr. *Arnaud*, that the custom of employing some terms in a metaphorical use does sometimes

in such a manner obscure the double idea, that the mind feels no more than the impression of the thing signifi'd and conceiv'd as true. This is exactly what I would have. I desire no more, and it signifies nothing to alledg that this does not contradict the rule which the Author of the Perpetuity had propos'd; because he spake only of terms which were really metaphorical, and not of equivocal terms, such as those are wherein the double idea is not felt. This, I say, signifies nothing, for besides that the Author of the Perpetuity had propos'd his Principle a little too generally, my exception invalidates the use which he would make of it; for it shews that in applying this Principle to the terms, *Corpus*, *Corpus Domini*, *Corpus Christi*, a man can draw no advantage thence, nor say that they brought into the mind the idea of the Real Presence, because that in effect these terms did not represent more than the idea of the Sacrament, according as our senses offer it.

I confess we cannot apply this remark to several passages of the Fathers, wherein the figure is more sensible; and therefore we have only apply'd it to these terms precisely, *Corpus*, *Corpus Domini*, *Corpus Christi*, by which the Sacrament has been often design'd. An answer is not the less good for being proper and particular to a subject. And as to other passages which the Author of the Perpetuity propos'd, we have already maintain'd, and do still, that their natural sense was the Sacramental one, and not that of the Real Presence, excepting some which we will speak to hereafter. And for the better understanding of this, we must first distinguish the particular sense of each term, from the sense of the whole proposition; each term has its proper common and ordinary signification, and being thus taken apart, brings naturally into the mind the idea of that which it signifies. But the first and natural sense of th'entire proposition must not always be taken from the natural signification of each term, but oft-times from the force of the matter in question which guides nature to a certain sense, without suffering her to imagin any other: and this is oft the metaphorical sense, which I illustrated by th' example of these propositions, *The Stone was Christ*, *The King is the head of Gold*, *The seven stalks are the seven years*. The particular terms *Stone*, *Christ*, *was*, taken apart do naturally bring into the mind the idea of what they signifie. *The Stone* offers the idea of a Rock, *Christ* the idea of Jesus Christ, *was*, gives the idea of an affirmation, but the simple and natural sense which results from these three terms gathered together, is no other than the metaphorical one, by reason of the matter in hand, which suffers not naturally the mind to conceive another. 'Tis the same in reference to these propositions, *The Bread is the Body of Jesus Christ*, *the Bread is made the Body of Jesus Christ*, *the Bread is chang'd into the Body of Jesus Christ*, *the Body of Jesus Christ enters into us*, *we receive the Body of Jesus Christ*, and such like. If a man considers each term of these in particular, they naturally bring into the mind the idea of what they ordinarily and commonly signifie, the *Bread*, that of Bread, *the Body of Jesus Christ*, that of the Body of Jesus Christ, *is*, that of an affirmation, *changed*, that of a change, *enter and receive*, that of an entrance, and reception: But the sense which results from these terms collected being determin'd by the matter in hand, can be naturally no other than a mystical sense, to wit, that the Bread is the Sacrament, the sign, the pledg, the memorial of the Body of Jesus Christ; that it serves us instead of it, that 'tis mystically chang'd into this Body, that this Body enters into us by its symbol, that we receive and partake of it by a spiritual reception and participation. This is the true and natural  
sense

sense of these expressions, and that which first presents it self to the mind by reason of the matter in hand.

NEITHER the truth of my Principle, nor the truth of the application which I make of it can be disputed me. The Principle is, that when the matter in question determines the propositions to a certain sense which they may reasonably receive, then we must not seek for the natural sense of these propositions in the natural signification of each term taken apart, but from the matter it self; and that the sense to which the matter determines them is the simple and natural sense. This Principle may be justifi'd by a thousand examples drawn from the ordinary use of human speech, in which is made every moment propositions, which would be senseless did not a man take the natural sense of the matter in question. Each Art and Profession has also its particular expressions which would be as so many extravagancies, were they not understood according as the matter determines them; and this is in my opinion, what no one can contradict. Th' application which I make of this Principle is no less undeniable; for 'tis true that the expressions of the Fathers on the Eucharist are determin'd to a certain sense by the very nature of the Eucharistical action, which is a Sacrament or a mystery of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ: Seeing then their expressions are capable of receiving a Sacramental and mystical sense, it must be granted that that is the natural sense.

THE natural sense of a proposition is that which may be most naturally in the mind of him that made it; but to judg well of it, we must consider the matter, and see whether it has not led them to explain themselves in this manner. Now it will be granted me that the question here being about signs or mystical symbols, and a Spiritual Communion which we have with Jesus Christ, men have more naturally in their thoughts the mystical and Sacramental sense than that of Transubstantiation, or Consubstantiation.

BUT besides this distinction which respects the expressions both in themselves, and in relation to those that have used them, there must be made another, which regards the persons to whom these expressions are addressed. For there are some that have small knowledg of the matter in hand, which know only confusedly what a Sacrament or mystery is, who have made little reflection on the manner after which our Lord communicates himself to us in the Eucharist; and there are others that have this knowledg more distinct and better form'd. Now it being the matter or subject in hand that determines the sense of these expressions, 'tis certain they are more or less clear, more or less intelligible, according as this matter is more or less understood by every one: But 'tis likewise certain, that to mark well the natural sense of 'em, we must suppose persons who have a distinct knowledg of the subject in question, and manner after which the Church has expressed her self about it, and not ignorant persons that have only a very obscure notion of it. The natural sense of th' expressions of each Art, and each Profession is without doubt not that in which those may take it, who have scarcely any knowledg of this Art, or this Profession but that wherein intelligent and able persons take it; and 'tis for this reason the later are consulted rather than the others upon any difficulty. I confess Religion ought to be the Art and Profession of the whole world, but men are neither wise nor honest enough to apply themselves exactly to it. It cannot be deny'd but there have been always many persons in the Church little advanced in the



the knowledge of the mystery of the Gospel. 'Tis not from them then that we must learn the natural sense of the expressions of the Fathers. They might have been the object of their Faith, tho not of their Understanding. I mean, they might believe 'em to be true without diving into the sense of 'em, and knowing what they signifie. And this is the meaning of S. Austin in his Sermon to Children. *What ye see, says he, is Bread and Wine, which your eyes likewise tell you, but the instruction which your Faith demands is, that the Bread is the Body of Jesus Christ, and the Cup, or that which is in the Cup his Blood. This is said in a few words, and perhaps this little is sufficient to Faith, but Faith desires to be instructed; for the Prophet says, If ye do, not believe, how will you understand? Ye may reply, seeing you have commanded us to believe, explain to us what that is, to the end we may understand it.* Whilst these persons remain in this degree of Faith without understanding, 'tis not to them we must address our selves for the finding out the natural sense of the propositions of the Fathers, seeing they do not understand 'em. We must desire this of them that are more advanced in knowledge, who know what the Church means by these ways of speaking, and can give a good account of the natural impression they make on their minds.

BUT who are these people? They are those that learn'd from the Fathers themselves, what a Sacrament or Mystery is, who knew that a *Mystery or Sacrament is when we see a thing, and understand and believe another, who knew that the Bread and Wine of the Eucharist are signs, images, figures, memorials, representations, resemblances, pictures of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, who knew, that the Bread and Wine are to us instead of the Body and Blood, that Jesus Christ is signified and communicated to us by means of these symbols, and that in partaking of this visible Bread we spiritually eat our Lords Flesh, who knew, that the signs take commonly the names of the things which they represent, that the Sacraments are called after the name of the things themselves, that our Saviour did not scruple to say, This is my Body, when he gave the sign of his Body, that he made Bread his Body in saying, This is my Body, that is to say, the figure of my Body, that we must distinguish between the Bread of our Lord, and the Bread which is the Lord himself, that the consecrated Bread is honored with the name of our Lords Body, altho the nature of Bread remains, that the nature or substance of Bread ceases not to be, and that that which we celebrate is the image or resemblance of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, who knew, that the humanity of Jesus Christ is local, absent from Heaven when on the Earth, and left the Earth when it ascended up into Heaven, that to eat the Flesh of Jesus Christ is to believe in him, that this locution is figurative, and must not be taken according to the letter, signifying we must communicate of our Lords Passion, and call to remembrance that his Flesh has been Crucified for us.*

'TIS such kind of persons as these who are well instructed in the sense of the Fathers, that are to be consulted to find the natural sense of these other expressions which Mr. Arnaud alledges in his favour. What likelihood is there that with these preparatives which they receiv'd daily from their Pastors they should stick at these expressions they heard 'em use, *That the Bread is the Body of Jesus Christ, that 'tis made the Body of Jesus Christ, changed into the Body of Jesus Christ, that the Body of Jesus Christ enters in to us, that we are refresh'd with his Blood, and nourish'd with his Flesh, and other expressions of this nature; what likelihood is there they should hesitate at 'em, or see any other sense in 'em, than the Sacramental or figurative*

one? Now these are the persons whereof my fifth rank consists, whom I supposed to have a knowledge of the truth more distinct and clear than the others, and a mind better fitted to understand the stile, and ordinary expressions of the Church. Let the same instructions, the same expositions be given now to the people which the Fathers gave them, let neither Transubstantiation, nor the Real Presence, nor the conversion of the substance of Bread into the very substance of Christ's Body, nor the Body of Jesus Christ concealed under the veil of accidents without a subject, nor the existence of these accidents without a subject, nor the real existence of the Body of Jesus Christ in several places, nor his double Presence, that is to say, his visible and invisible one, nor his Sacramental state after the manner of a Spirit be mention'd, let 'em not be enjoyn'd to adore the Sacrament of the Eucharist with that Sovereign adoration which is due to Jesus Christ alone; and in a word, let all things be suppress'd which we find the Fathers did not speak or do, and let the impressions and prejudications which these novelties have introduc'd into mens minds be lost: let the same instructions and expositions, I say, be given to the people now which the Fathers gave them, and then let 'em be told as long as you will, that the Bread is the Body of Jesus Christ, that 'tis chang'd into the Body of Jesus Christ; for I am persuaded, and believe every reasonable man will be so too, that the people will never conceive from these expressions either Transubstantiation, or Consubstantiation, but understand 'em, without difficulty in a Sacramental sense. Where! Where's then this great noise which the Real Presence made, *knocking*, as the Author of the *Perpetuity* words it, *millions of times at the gate of the hearts of all the Faithful*? Is not this clatter a mere dream, and has Mr. Arnaud any reason to reproach me with the deafness of my ears?

BUT 'twill perhaps be question'd, whether persons of mean capacity (whom we do not suppose to have this knowledge of the stile and sense of the Church) did not receive by these words the impression of the Real Presence. I answer, we shall do 'em no wrong by supposing they did not understand them: *You have commanded us to believe*, said they in *S. Austin*; *explain to us then, how the Bread is the Body of Jesus Christ, to the end we may understand it.* They did not understand it then before the explication. In effect the greatest part of the Fathers words taken literally are void of any natural sense, Philosophy must give 'em one; for how can we understand naturally that the Bread is the Body of Jesus Christ, according to a literal sense, or chang'd into the Body of Jesus Christ, seeing we behold it still to be Bread? I confess there are some of these expressions which are apt to offer to ignorant people the idea of a Real Presence, but not of the real invisible and incorporeal Presence, touching which we contend, but on the contrary, the idea of a corporeal Presence, for a mans mind, especially that of an ignorant man, does not imagin the existence of a human, invisible, insensible, and impalpable Body. I moreover say, that this idea of the corporeal Presence would be immediately rejected as false by the most stupid and ignorant, from the testimony of their own senses, which they could not but consult, supposing at least they knew Christ's Body was a human one. But supposing they did not, 'tis likely their simplicity would lead them to believe that the natural Body of Jesus Christ was really upon Earth in the form of Bread, such as they saw in the Eucharist: and this is what *S. Austin* says little Children would do were they earnestly and gravely told 'tis the Body of Jesus Christ.

As

A S to the passages of *S. Hilary*, and *Gregory of Nyffe*, which *Mr. Arnaud* alledges, as offering the idea of the Real Presence, I confess the first is able to surprize th' ignorant, and make 'em conceive a corporeal Presence; seeing it has these words, that Jesus Christ is in us *in reality of nature, and not by a simple consent of will*: and then again, that Jesus Christ *dwells in us naturally*; which literally signifies that our Lords Flesh exists in us in such an ordinary and corporeal manner as the flesh of animals exists in us when we eat 'em; which was the sense wherein the Capernaits took the words of Jesus Christ. *Mr. Arnaud* himself seems to have acknowledg'd this, seeing he believ'd himself oblig'd to add in his Translation a corrective that mollifies or explains this term *naturally*. *Naturally*, says he, *that is to say, really*. But this, *that is to say, really*, ought not to be written in Italick, as if 'twere *S. Hilary's* own explication; and if the fault be the Printer's, and not *Mr. Arnaud's*, he should at least have set it in the Errata, because it causes two illusions at a time: on one hand it makes a man believe *S. Hilary* taught the Real Presence of Jesus Christ in us, in proper terms, seeing he says that he remains in us *naturally, that is to say, really*, which is not true: and on the other it hinders us from perceiving that the ignorant taking the *naturally* of *S. Hilary* according to the letter, would have had the idea of a corporal and natural Presence, and not that of a spiritual and invisible Presence. These are a kind of faults for which people are not wont to be sorry when they happen; for they have a desir'd effect for some time, and when they chance to be discover'd may be laid on the Printer. But howsoever 'tis certain that all the impression which this passage of *S. Hilary* could make on the mind of an ignorant person was only to put him upon conceiving a corporal Presence, which he might easily reject, by the testimony of his proper senses. But to speak the truth, there's little reason to suppose the Books of *S. Hilary De Trinitate* came to the knowledg of such ignorant and simple people as we speak of.

THE passage of *Gregory of Nyffe* gives naturally the idea of a change of Bread into the Body of Jesus Christ, by the union of the Bread into the Word, and by way of augmentation of the natural Body of Jesus Christ, as appears from the example which he brings of the Bread which Jesus Christ ate, which became the Body of the Word, which is far remote from the Transubstantiation of the Church of *Rome*, who will have the substance on the Altar to be the same in number as that which our Saviour Christ assum'd from the Virgin, and which is now in Heaven. There's little likelihood that simple and ignorant people understood what *Gregory* meant, even supposing they were acquainted with his Catechism, which is not very likely. But supposing they knew it all by heart, and comprehended the sense of it, they could thence only conceive this change by union to the word, and augmentation of the Body of Jesus Christ, which *Damascen* has since explained more clearly. And this is what *Gregory* supposes also, not as the true Faith of the Church, but only as a probable opinion, according as he formally explains himself, *Perhaps, says he, we are in the right*.

AND this is what we had to say concerning *Mr. Arnaud's* sixth Book. Whatsoever success this Dispute might have had, he could not thence promise himself any advantage, because as we have already observ'd more than once, the eight first Centuries being out of the time wherein we suppose the change was wrought, when he shall have proved the Real Presence, or Real



Absence was distinctly held therein, he will be still told the question concerns not those Ages, but the following. But 'tis not the same with me, who draw thence several advantages. For first, neither Mr. *Arnaud*, nor the Author of the *Perpetuity* can henceforward prevail by the equivocation of the term of Real Absence, which may be taken either for the rejection of the visible or corporeal Presence, or for the rejection of th' invisible Presence, seeing we have shew'd 'em that in this debate the question concerns not the Real Absence in the first sense, but the Real Absence in the second. Secondly, They can no longer confound these two things as if they were but one, to wit, to be in a condition to acknowledg that the Real Presence does not agree with the lights of nature, and to be in a condition to acknow. ledg 'tis a novelty which was never held in the Church, seeing we have shew'd 'em there's a great deal of difference between these two dispositions, and that it does not follow hence that those who are in the first, are also in the second, which is precisely that which is here in question. Thirdly, Neither will they I think any more confound two sorts of very different doubts, the one of incredulity which deny the thing it self, and the others of simple ignorance which consist only in not knowing the manner, yet without denying the thing, seeing they have been shew'd clearly enough the difference of 'em, and that they ought not to refer to one of these doubts what belongs to the other. Fourthly, They can no longer blind the world by this vain distinction of three ways of rejecting the Real Presence, or by a general rejection, without denoting any one kind of 'em, or by a formal rejection of all the kinds, or by a bare view of the nature of things, seeing we have shew'd 'em that the first is impossible, that the third brings no advantage to 'em, and that there's only the second which they can reasonably stick to, and which yet they renounce, because they find it unjustifiable. Fifthly, 'Tis likely they will no longer obstinately maintain that a known inconsistency, that is to say, a pure impossibility, and respected as such, is a sense after th' illustrations given on this subject. Sixthly, They can no longer say that the ancient formulary of the Communion, *Corpus Christi must necessarily direct the minds of the Faithful to conceive the Body of Jesus Christ present in the Eucharist which they receiv'd*, seeing it had another use, which was to raise 'em up to meditate on the Death and Resurrection of their Saviour; this other use being sufficient to employ many of their minds. Seventhly, They will henceforward in vain pretend that the terms which the Fathers used in their ordinary instructions, brought naturally the idea of the Real Presence into their Auditors minds, seeing we have shew'd that the natural sense of their Propositions did not depend on the natural signification of each term, but on the matter in hand, which determin'd them to a figurative sense. Eighthly, They have had no reason to pretend that all the Faithful have always had a distinct belief either of the Presence or Real Absence, in the sense wherein the Roman Church understands these terms, seeing we have shew'd them five ranks of persons in the Church of the first eight Centuries, who had no formal knowledge of either the one nor th' other. Ninthly, It being thus in reference to the first eight Centuries, it hence follows 'twas the same by greater reason in the following, which were far darker. Tenthly, And that which is most important is that one may already know by this, that the change which occasions our principal question has been not only possible, but easie. For there being only two things which can hinder it, the one the distinct belief of the Real Absence, that is to say, the formal and positive belief that the Body is not in the Eucharist by its proper substance, neither visible nor invisible; and th' other the knowledge, diligence,

diligence, and fidelity of the Pastors, watching over their Flocks, ready to acknowledge and repel the new errors, and make them known to their people. 'Tis already apparent that the first of these things is an unjustifiable supposition, and contrary to all probability. And as to the other 'tis certain it calls in question the credit of all Historians, and the judgment of all learned men who agree in this, that in the 9th. 10th. and 11th. Centuries th' Ecclesiastical order did not abound with famous men, and especially the 10th. Century.

## CHAP. V.

*General Considerations on Mr. Arnaud's Ninth Book. An Examination of the Objections which he proposes against what he calls Machins of Abridgment, and Machins of Preparation.*

HAVING consider'd Mr. Arnaud's 6th. Book, we must now in order pass on to the 9th. whose running Title is, *The impossibility of the pretended Change of the Churches Belief in the Mystery of the Eucharist.* 'Tis certain the genuine state of the question is only, whether this change has really hapned; this other, whether 'twas possible or impossible, is a frivolous question tending to fruitless Speculations and tedious Debates; which is what I clearly shew'd when I treated of the method of the *Perpetuity*. And which likewise several Roman Catholicks have acknowledged, who have written on this Subject since the Author of the *Perpetuity*. Father Nöuet was of opinion he had better lay aside all this part of the Dispute, and comprehend it under the Title of *Particular Debates* wherein the Church of Rome is not concerned, nor ought to be mention'd. Mr. De Banné in that elegant Letter which he publish'd under the name of an Ecclesiastick to one of his Friends, distinguishes likewise two quarrels wherein he says I have engaged my self, the one against the Real Presence in the Eucharist, and the other against the Author of the *Perpetuity* of the Faith: and he adds, *that in this latter I only encounter with a particular person.* Mr. Pavillon, a Priest and Almoner to his Majesty speaks his mind more fully in his triumph touching the Eucharist. *The question is not to examine whether the Church could change her belief, and how this change could happen; for this is a going about the bush, and running upon whimsies. The question is only to enquire whether this pretended change has effectually hapned.* He calls all these pretensions of impossibility frivolous questions, and mere whimsies; for these Gentlemen do one another right now and then. But howsoever Mr. Arnaud has his maxims apart, and he obliges us to distinguish on this subject two questions; the one, whether the change before us has been possible; and the other whether it has really hapned. 'Tis certain that the first appears already very clear by the refutation of the pretended distinct knowledge of the Presence, or Real Absence, as we lately observed: for altho Mr. Arnaud has treated of it only in reference to the eight first Centuries, without troubling himself with the following; yet 'tis easie to perceive that if it could not have place in those Centuries, wherein there was greater light, it could not by stronger reason in the others, wherein there was a far greater and more general ignorance. Yet for better information

In his Preface.

Page 197.

tion in this matter, we must see what Mr. *Arnaud* has offer'd touching this pretended impossibility of the change. We shall here then discuss again the question, whether in supposing that *Paschasius* an Author of the ninth Century was the first that propos'd the Doctrin of the substantial invisible Presence of the Body of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist, it might happen that this opinion in succession of time has been receiv'd and establish'd amongst Christians. For this is in fine what Mr. *Arnaud* handles in his 9th. Book, and which we shall now examine. We shall not in truth find he has made use therein of great Arguments to confirm his Opinion, for he seldom troubles himself about that; nor has he exactly endeavour'd to refute the means of the possibility which I alledged, nor defended the Answers of the Author of the *Perpetuity*. Mr. *Arnaud* does not care to take so much pains. But we shall find he has taken care to collect here and there seven or eight passages out of my Book, and of them joyn'd together made a body, which he calls my *Machins*, and divided them into five orders, with titles according to his own fancy. He calls the first, *The Machins of Abridgment*; the second, *The Machins of Preparation*; the third, *The Machins of Mollifications*; the fourth, *The Machins of Execution*; and the fifth, *The Machins of Forgetfulness*. Now altho we may say in general that Mr. *Arnaud*'s mind abounds with pleasant fancies, by which he can easily find out odd names to make serious matters look ridiculous; yet to excuse him, we may say that in this occasion he has follow'd, not his own natural inclination, but that of the Cartesian Philosophy, with which his mind is said to be extremely taken up; for you must know this Philosophy makes *Machins* of every thing. But howsoever let's see what work Mr. *Arnaud* makes with mine.

Answer to the  
second Treatise,  
Part 3.  
ch. 6. Book 9.  
ch. 3. p. 886.

THE first which he calls the *Machin* of retrenchment is taken out of two of my passages; the first of which bears, *That the question is not of the whole world, but of the West*, on which Mr. *Arnaud* makes this Commentary in my name, *That is to say*, says he, *I will not have the question concern it, I will not take the trouble to explain how the Doctrin of the Real Presence and Transubstantiation has introduc'd it self into the East, into the Patriarchats of Constantinople, Alexandria, Jerusalem, and Antioch, into the Churches of the Armenians, Nestorians, Jacobites. I do not care to trouble my self with guessing how it has penetrated into Ethiopia, Moscovia, Mesopotamia, Georgia, Mingrelia, Moldavia, Tartaria and the Indies. 'Tis better to say, 'tis not there, this is sooner done; and by this means I shall free my self out of a great perplexity. But*, says he, *Mr. Claude will give us I hope leave to tell him, that he is a man and not God; so that neither his words nor his will are always effectual. He would not have the Doctrin of the Real Presence to be in all these great Provinces. But it is there, and will be maugre him. The matter depends not on him, and we have demonstrated it by proofs which I hope he will not question. He fills five great pages with this kind of discourse, saying over and over again the same thing.*

Mr. *ARNAUD* must pardon me if I tell him he has gotten a little too high. Is he so possess'd with the charms of his own Eloquence, and force of these illusions touching the Greeks, Armenians, and other Eastern Christians to imagin a man must be a God to cope with him? I think considering what we have observed, a man need neither be an Angel nor an extraordinary person to demonstrate again clearly that the question concerns not these Churches, because they do not at all believe the Roman Transubstantiation: and supposing they did believe it, which they do not, 'twould be

no



no hard matter to find they had received it from the Latins by means of the Croisado's, Seminaries, and Missions, which is sufficient t' exclude them from this Dispute.

THE second passage from whence Mr. Arnaud has taken my pretended Machin of Retrenchment, is this, *The question concerns not all those in the West, who profess themselves Christians, but only one party that have grown prevalent, and endeavoured to get the Pulpits to themselves, thereby to become Rulers over the whole Church.* Whereupon he cries out, *Did ever any body affirm that the common people of the 11th. Century held not the Real Presence, and had only a confused knowledge of this Mystery?* But Mr. Arnaud does not mind what he writes. We speak of the first fifty years of the 10th. Century, and he comes and alledges to us the common people of the 11th. Century. 'Tis sufficient we tell him, says the Author of the Perpetuity, that *this change cannot be attributed to the first fifty years of this Century, to wit, of the 10th. seeing 'tis incredible that the Faithful of the whole Earth having been instructed in the distinct belief of the Real Absence, should have embraced an Opinion quite contrary in condemning their first sentiments, and without this change's having made any noise.* These are the very words I recited, and on which having said, *that the question concerned not a change begun, and finished in the 10th. Century, but the progress of a change begun eighty two years before the 10th. Century, and finished by the Popes towards the end of the 11th.* I added, that our Debate was not about all those in the West that professed themselves Christians, but only about one party that strengthened themselves, and endeavour'd to become masters of the Pulpit, that they might afterwards be masters of the whole Church. It evidently appears the question was about the first fifty years of the 10th. Century. And thereupon Mr. Arnaud tells us by way of exclamation, *Is there any one that affirms the common people of the 11th. Century held not the Real Presence, and had only a confus'd knowledge of this Mystery?* No, Berenger himself acknowledges the contrary in calling this Doctrine the Opinion of the people, *sententia vulgi*, and in maintaining the Church was perished. It must be acknowledg'd there's a strange disorder in this kind of disputing. I will grant that the common people of the 11th. Century held the opinion of the Real Presence, thro the labours of Paschasus his Disciples; but it does not follow 'twas the same in the first fifty years of the 10th. for when a new Doctrine disperses it self in a Church, an hundred and fifty years make great alterations in it. When we speak of the time in which Paschasus wrote his Book of the Body and Blood of Christ, 'tis not likely we suppose the people to be in the same state they were in two hundred years after the opinion of the Real Presence had made considerable progresses. Neither will we suppose 'em to be in the same state the first fifty years of the 10th. Century; for when we speak of a change which was made in the space of near three hundred years, common sense will shew there was more or less of it according to the diversity of the time. It is then reasonable on my hypothesis to consider in the beginning of the 10th. Century those that held the Real Presence, only as a party that strengthened themselves, and endeavour'd to make 'em selves most considerable in the Church, but 'tis in no sort reasonable t' oppose against this the common people of the 11th. Century, seeing that in eighty, or an hundred years the face of things might be easily changed.

'TIS moreover less reasonable to offer us the discourses of Lanfranc, who bragg'd, that in his time all the Christians in the world believed they receiv'd

Answer to the second Treatise, Part. 3. ch. 6.

Book 9. ch. 3. p. 890.

Refut part 3. ch. 6.

Book 9. ch. 3. pag. 890.

receiv'd in this Sacrament *the true Flesh and Blood of Jesus Christ, born of the Virgin*. For supposing what *Lanfranc* says were true, the sense he gave to these words, *the true Flesh, and the true Blood of Jesus Christ*, understanding them in a sense of Transubstantiation was false, as we have sufficiently shew'd. *Has any body charged this testimony to be false?* says *Mr. Arnaud*, No; *there's no one but Mr. Claude who does it six hundred years after without any ground*. But does *Mr. Arnaud* know all that *Berenger* answer'd, and those that adher'd to him? And supposing they were ignorant of the true belief of the other Churches separate from the Latin, does it hence follow that in effect they believed Transubstantiation, and that the proofs I have given of the contrary be not good?

Ibid

*DOES Reason*, adds he, *shew that in this point, the Faith of the Pastors was not that of the People?* No; it proves the quite contrary, it being incredible that Ministers who are persuaded of the truth of the Real Presence should not take care t' instruct them in it, whom they exhorted to receive the Communion, to whom they ought to judge this belief to be absolutely necessary to make them avoid the unworthy Communion. *Mr. Arnaud* fights with his own shadow. We never told him that those who believe the Real Presence did not endeavour t' insinuate it into the peoples minds, according as they were more or less prejudiced, or zealous in the propagation of this belief, and more or less qualifi'd to teach it, and more or less again according to the circumstances of times, occasions, persons. But how does this hinder me from saying that during the first fifty years of the 10th. Century it was not all them that made profession of Christianity in the West, but a party that strengthened themselves, and endeavour'd to render themselves the most considerable.

*I S this*, says *Mr. Arnaud* again, *a sufficient reason to shew that the people were not persuaded of the Real Presence, because some Historians who tell us that Berenger troubled the Church by a new Hereſie, do at the same time likewise inform us that he perverted several persons with his novelties?* But we did not offer this alone as a sufficient reason to persuade him the people did not believe the Real Presence in the beginning of the 10th. Century. I confess that upon this alone one may justly say either that those who follow'd *Berenger*, follow'd him in leaving their first Belief, and embracing a new Opinion, or that they follow'd him because he Preach'd only what they believ'd before, or that they adher'd to him because they were further instructed in a mystery of which they had but small knowledg, or little certainty. So far every man is at liberty to take that part which he shall judge the most reasonable: but should I say there were several that follow'd him upon the account of their knowing what he taught was the ancient Doctrin, I shall say nothing but what's very probable, having shew'd, as I have done in my answer to the *Perpétuity*, that *Bertran's* Doctrin was publickly taught in the 10th. Century; for it follows hence probably enough, that this Doctrin was not then wholly extinct, that is to say, in the beginning of the 11th. Century, when *Berenger* appear'd.

THESE are *Mr. Arnaud's* first objections, which as is plainly seen, are not over demonstrative, that the change we suppose is impossible. Those which follow are not much better, as will appear from the reflections we shall make on 'em. The second order of these pretended *Machins* which he attributes to me, is what he calls *Machins of Preparations*, and he draws these

these from two passages, the one of my first answer, and th'other from my second. The first is contain'd in these terms; *In this dark Age, that is to say in the 10th. the distinct knowledg of the true Doctrin was lost, not only in reference to the Sacrament, but almost all other Points of the Christian Religion.* The second speaks of the Ages which followed the first eight in these terms. *The first light which was taken from the people to keep 'em in ignorance was God's Word. The second was the clear and solid Expositions of the Writings of the Holy Fathers in reference to the Sacrament. The third, the knowledg of other Mysteries of Christianity which might strengthen mens minds, and encourage their zeal for the truth. The fourth was suffering natural reason to decay and fall into a kind of languishment. And as to their senses they had open War declar'd against 'em.*

Answer to the  
second Trea-  
tise, Part 2.  
chap. 3.

THOSE that shall take the pains to read the 4th. Chapter of Mr. Arnaud's 9th. Book, which has for its title, *The Machins of Preparation Examind*, will find therein a prodigious profusion of words, much heat and vehement declamations, but very few things worth regarding; wherefore passing by, as I shall do whatsoever is useles and redundant, the rest will not take up much time. First he charges me with offering things without any foundation, proof, or reason. I answer then Mr. Arnaud has forgot the proofs we brought touching the disorders of the 10th. Century, and according to his reckoning the testimonies of Guirmond, Verner Rolievink, Marc Antony Sabellic, John Stella, Polydor Virgil, Elfric Arch bishop of Canterbury, Edgar King of England, Genebrard, Bellarmin, Baronius, Nicolas Vignier, and the Author of the Apology for the Holy Fathers the defenders of the Doctrin of Divine Grace, shall be esteem'd as nothing. The one tells us, *That the truths of Religion were vanish'd away in this Age from men.* The other, *That therein was a total neglect of all ingenious Arts.* The third, *That all persons in general so greatly indulg'd themselves in idleness, that all kinds of Virtues seem'd to be laid asleep with 'em.* The fourth, *That the Monks and Priests minded only th' enriching themselves.* The fifth, *That the Bishops and Priests neglected the reading of the Holy Scriptures, and instructing the people out of 'em.* The sixth, *That the Church-men spent their lives in Debauches, Drunkenness, and Uncleanness.* The seventh, *That 'twas an unhappy Age, an Age void of excelling men either in Wit or Learning.* The eighth, *That there were no famous Writers in it, nor Councils, nor Popes that took care of any thing.* The ninth, *That Barbarism and ignorance of Learning and Sciences either Divine or Human reigned more in it than in the former Ages.* The tenth, *That 'twas an iron and leaden Age, an obscure and dark Age.* And the eleventh, *That 'twas an Age of Darknes and Ignorance, where in excepting some few Historians, there were no famous Writers on the Mysteries of Faith.* Mr. Arnaud knows all this, and that we might increase the number of these Testimonies with several others, were it necessary, yet tells me with the greatest transport, *That I offer things without any ground, proof, or reason, things which I know to be false, and mere imaginations.*

Chap. 4. page  
891.

Page 892.

HE says, adds he speaking of me, *that the distinct knowledg of almost all the other Mysteries but that of the Eucharist was lost in the 10th. Age.* Now he knows the contrary of this; and is persuaded of it, seeing that as to the common Mysteries, and such as are believed by both Parties, and contained in the ancient Symbol, it cannot be said they of the 10th. Age were ignorant of 'em; and yet as to the points controverted between the Calvinists, and the Roman Church, excepting that of the Eucharist, all the Ministers his Brethren do

Chap. 4. page  
829.

Y y

frankly



*frankly acknowledg, that long before the 9th. and 10th. Century the whole Church believed what the Roman Church does believe at present of 'em. Let him tell us then what are these truths of Faith, the distinct knowledg of which were lost in the 10th. Century.*

'TIS no hard matter to satisfie Mr. Arnaud. These truths the distinct knowledg of which was lost in the 10th. Century are the same which are contained in the Symbols. Does he imagin that if a man be not ignorant of the Symbols, that therefore he must know distinctly the Mysteries therein contained; and does he put no difference between being ignorant of a thing, confusedly knowing it, and distinctly knowing it? Do all those that know the *Creed*, distinctly understand the Mysteries contained therein? Certainly a mans mind must be strangely benighted that reasons after this manner. *They were not ignorant of the Mysteries contain'd in the ancient Symbols, they had then a distinct knowledg of 'em.* If this Argument holds good we may attribute the distinct knowledg of the principal Points of Christianity almost to all kinds of persons, to Artificers, Husbandmen, Women, yea Children; for there are few in either Communion but have heard of them, and know something in 'em, and yet it must be granted there are few of these who can be properly said to know them distinctly. I pretend not to treat here on the common place of the confused knowledg, and the distinct knowledg. This is needless. 'Tis sufficient to observe that the term of distinct knowledg is equivocal; for 'tis sometimes taken for the formal and expresse knowledg of a thing, in opposition to the ignorance of this same thing, or to what the Schools call an implicit knowledg; and sometimes 'tis taken for a clear and full knowledg, in opposition to a confused and perplex'd one. When the Author of the *Perpetuity* said that all the Faithful ought always to have a distinct knowledg of the Presence, or Real Absence, he took the term *distinct knowledg* in the first sense; for he did not mean that all the Faithful must know clearly and fully the Doctrin of the Real Presence in every respect, but that they had a formal, expresse and determinate thought of rejecting or admitting it. But when I said that the distinct knowledg of the Mystery of the Eucharist, and almost all the other Mysteries of Christian Religion was lost in the 10th. Century, I took this term in the second sense, meaning not that there was no more formal knowledg of these Mysteries; that is to say, that they form'd no more any expresse and determin'd thought on the Articles of the Christian Faith, and that Jesus Christ is God and Man, that he was born of a Virgin, died for us, rose again and ascended up into Heaven, and that there is an Eucharist; but meaning that they had only a very small knowledg of them, such as is common to persons unlearned, and who rarely apply themselves to meditate on matters of Religion; who go indeed for Christians, but trouble themselves with no more knowledg than barely to learn the Creed, and receive some other general Instructions. 'Tis easily perceived that this was my sense, and that the ignorance I attribute to these persons of the 10th. Century, from the concurrent Testimony of all Historians, was not so great as to keep 'em absolutely from all knowledg of the principal Points of Christian Religion, as if they were become Pagans, or Atheists, or brut Beasts, but that it hindred them from having that clearness of apprehension and distinct knowledg, which comes by study and pains, and the hearing of able Preachers. Which will evidently appear upon consulting the particular places of my Answer, wherein I treat of the 10th. Century; for I attribute to it a confused knowledg of the Mysteries of Religion. Now a confused knowledg is moreover a formal knowledg,

Else-

Elsewhere I compare their knowledg to that of a Child who is wont to see his Nurse, ill dress'd, lean and sick, which still supposes he sees her, altho he sees her not in her usual condition. In another place I say *the Pastors grew careless of instructing the People, and the People likewise of informing themselves in matters of Religion; that there were few persons that applied themselves to the meditating on the Christian Mysteries; that the Pastors extremely neglected th<sup>e</sup> instructing of the People, and that the People grew as careless as they in matters of their salvation.* Now the meaning of all this is not that they wholly lost all kind of knowledg, but that it was very scanty. In fine, 'twill appear this is my sense to him that shall cast his eyes on the use I pretend to make of the obscurity of the 10th. Age, which was to shew that the people of it had not light enough to discern whether the Doctrin of the Real Presence was an innovation in the Christian Religion, or whether 'twas a Doctrin of the Fathers. Now this does not oblige a man to suppose an absolute ignorance of the Christian Mysteries, but that the knowledg of them was very confused. Which Mr. Arnaud could have well enough seen, if he pleas'd; but he thought 'twere better to betake himself to Sophisms, imagining they would not be laid open, and that he might so disguise the subject that few persons should be able to understand it. And 'tis on this Principle which is neither true, nor sincere, that he has grounded this reasoning, the common Mysteries held at this day by both Parties, and contained in the ancient Symbols were not unknown in the 10th. Century; therefore they of that Age had a distinct knowledg of the truths of the Christian Doctrin.

First Answer  
near the end.Answer to the  
second Treatise,  
Part 2.  
ch. 3. and  
Part 3. ch. 7.

WHATSOEVER follows in his fourth Chapter turns upon the same equivocation. *Did they leave off, says he, reading the Holy Scripture in the Churches and Cloisters? Did they give over explaining of it to the People and, teaching it in the Schools? Do not the writings of those Authors which we have that lived in that Century, such as those of S. Odon and Raterius Bishop of Verone make it appear that the Scriptures and Fathers were studied. Why does he say that the people had concealed from 'em the clear and solid expositions of the Fathers. Was not the Eucharist therein called the Sacrament of the Body of Jesus Christ, the Mystery of the Body of Jesus Christ, Bread and Wine?* But all these interrogations are needless. A man may say they did not absolutely give over the reading of the holy Scripture, and expounding it. Perhaps Odon and Raterius were a little studious. Perhaps the Eucharist was called a Sacrament, a Mystery, Bread and Wine; and yet it may not follow the People had a distinct knowledg of the points of Religion. The Greeks, Armenians, Moscovites, Ethiopians, Jacobites, Nestorians did not wholly lay aside the reading of the Holy Scripture, and of some Fathers in their Church, and Cloisters; and yet is it true that all these people, yea their very Monks and Prelates lived in a very confused knowledg of the mysteries of the Gospel.

Page 892.

WHAT he adds touching some Historians, and Bishops that wrote Books, is built on the same foundation. Besides that there appears not any thing in these Authors but what is very mean, their small number does well warrant our saying this Age was void of Learned men, and that people had but a very confused knowledg of the mysteries of the Gospel.

'TIS false, saith he, that in this Age open War was denounced against the senses. If this be false, how does he himself understand they taught Tran-

Y y 2

substan-

substantiation in it? For can this Doctrin be taught without opposing the testimony of our senses, seeing they shew us it is Bread and Wine?

BUT these small objections are very inconsiderable in comparison of Mr. Arnaud's grand pretension, which is, *that this confused knowledge which I attribute to the 10th. Century, is but a mere empty sound, whose sense I my self do not understand. In searching his Book, says he, in what sense he took it, I found that confused knowledge and distinct knowledge are one and the same thing in his language, which is to say, that the knowledge which he calls confused is every whit as clear as that which he calls distinct.* This discovery would be a very fine one indeed, were it not merely imaginary. 'Tis grounded on that describing some-where the instructions of the Fathers of the eight first Centuries, I say, *that they taught therein the Sacrament to be Bread and Wine, that this Bread and Wine were the signs and Figures of the Body of Jesus Christ, that they lost not their natural substance, but were called the Body and Blood of Christ, because they were the Sacraments of 'em.* He hence concludes that 'tis in these Articles wherein consists according to my way the distinct knowledge of the Mystery of the Eucharist. He afterwards observes that in another place speaking of the truth of the Eucharist which have been always popular, I say, *That the Mystery of the Eucharist has been always popular in the outward form of its celebration, and in the general acts which Christians ought to perform in it. To take Bread, to drink Wine in remembrance of the Death and Resurrection of Jesus Christ our Lord, to receive these things with a religious frame of mind as a great Sacrament which the Lord has ordained, to raise up ones Faith to the Body and Blood of our Saviour, to find therein the consolation of our Souls; this without doubt is popular. It is popular to hearken to the testimony of sense which tells us that 'tis Bread, and yet to hear that 'tis the Body of Christ, the Sacrament of the Body of Christ, its pledg, its memorial. It is popular to know that Jesus Christ is in Heaven, and that from thence he shall come to judg both the quick and dead.* Whence he concludes with Authority that the distinct knowledge which I give to the first Ages, and the confused one which I attribute to the 10th, are but one and the same thing.

IT must be allowed that never any consequence was more violently drawn than that of Mr. Arnaud's. First, It is not true that the Articles which I give of the distinct knowledge, are the same with those of the popular knowledge. Among the first is found, *That the Bread and Wine lose not their natural substance. That they are called the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, because they are the Sacraments of 'em,* which is not found in the Articles of the popular knowledge. How will he have this to be then one and the same thing. There is a great deal of difference between harkening to the testimony of ones proper senses which shew the Eucharist to be Bread and Wine, and learning from the instructions of Pastors that the Eucharist is Bread and Wine. The first induces a man to believe that to judg of it by sense 'tis real Bread and Wine, but the second goes farther; for it shews this very thing which the senses depose, to be the true belief of the Church. Now these two things are wholly different as any man may see. The first does not dispose men to reject Transubstantiation as a novelty contrary to the Faith of the Church, for it remains still to know whether the Faith of the Church be not contrary to the testimony of sense. The second does dispose 'em to it; for it shews that the Doctrin of the Church is according to the deposition of the senses. Now the first is according to my  
rule



rule belonging to the popular knowledg; and the second belongs to the distinct knowledg. What reason is there then in having these two knowledges to be the same. Thirdly, Mr. *Arnaud* has not observed that when I spake of the distinct knowledg of the eight first Centuries, I did not pretend exactly to denote all the Articles of it, this was not my business in that place. But only to observe some of the principal ones which were sufficient to make known the sense of these Propositions, *The Bread is the Body of Jesus Christ, it is changed into the Body of Jesus Christ.* But it does not hence follow but that there were therein some others very considerable ones, which may be gathered from the passages of the Fathers, which I produc'd in my first part, as *that the change which happens in the Eucharist is not a change of Nature, but an addition of Grace to Nature; that Jesus Christ, as to his human Body, or human Nature, is so in Heaven that he is no more on Earth; that the manducation of the Body of Jesus Christ is spiritual and mystical; that we must not understand it literally, it being a figurative expression; that the Sacrament and the verity represented by the Sacrament are two distinct things:* and several others which are not necessary to be related. Supposing it were true that the Articles of the popular knowledg were the same with those I mark'd of the distinct knowledg, which is evidently false, yet would it not follow that these two knowledges according to my sense would be the same thing, seeing I never pretended to make an exact enumeration of all the points of the distinct knowledg, nor exclude them which I now denoted, which are no wise popular. In fine, Mr. *Arnaud* has not considered that of the same Articles, whether popular, or not popular, a man may have a distinct knowledg and a confused one, according as he makes a greater or lesser reflection on them, according as they are respected with more or less application, according as each of those that has the knowledg of 'em has more or less understanding, natural or acquired; so that supposing we attributed to the distinct knowledg of the eight first Centuries only the Articles which I specif'd, supposing these Articles were the same as those I attribute to the popular knowledg, which is not true; supposing again there were no difference in 'em, as there is in respect of some of these Articles, between the knowing of 'em popularly, that is to say, either by the help of the Senses, or by the natural motion of the Conscience; and to know them by the instruction of the Pastors, as a thing which the Church believes, and from which a man must not vary, it would in no wise thence follow that the confused knowledg were according to what I laid down, the same thing; the object of these two knowledges would be the same, but the knowledges would be distinct. And thus have we shewed Mr. *Arnaud's* subtilties.

## C H A P. VI.

*Mr. Arnaud's Objections against what he calls the Machins of Mollification, and the Machins of Execution Examined. The State of the Twelfth Century.*

Answer to the  
second Treatise,  
Part 2.  
chap. 7.

Book 9. ch. 5.  
page 899.

**M**R. ARNAUD will not suffer me to say in my Answer to the Author of the *Perpetuity*, That Error does not insinuate it self by way of opposition, or a formal contradiction of the truth, but by way of addition, explication, and confirmation, and that it endeavours to ally it self with the ancient Faith to prevent its immediate opposition. And this is what he calls my *Machins of Mollification*, which he pretends to overthrow in his fifth Chapter. The inventions, says he, of Mr. Claude are usually attended with very considerable defects. To which I have no more to say but this, that the pretensions of Mr. Arnaud are commonly very high, but generally very ill grounded; well offer'd, but ill defended.

Lib. De Corpore  
& Sang. Dom.  
cap. 2.

Epist. ad Frud.

Book 9. ch. 6.  
page 913.

'TIS false, says he, that *Paschasus* did not teach his Doctrine, by expressly condemning those that were of a contrary Opinion. Mr. Arnaud hides himself under a thin vail, pretending not to understand what he does very well. We do not say that *Paschasus* did not propose his Doctrine by condemning those of a contrary Opinion. This is not the point in question. The question is, Whether he did not propose his Doctrine as the Doctrine of the Church, which was not sufficiently understood, and which he therefore more clearly explain'd? Now *Paschasus* himself decides this difference, as I have shewed in my Answer to the *Perpetuity*. For speaking in the beginning of his Book touching his design, he says, That all the Faithful ought to understand the Sacrament of our Lords Body and Blood, which is every day celebrated in the Church, and what they ought to believe and know of it. That we must seek the virtue of it, and instruct our Faith under the Discipline of Jesus Christ, lest we be esteem'd unworthy, if we do not discern it enough, not understanding what is the dignity, and the virtue of the mystical Body and Blood of our Saviour. And lest it should be imagin'd this was only a way of speaking to excite the Faithful to instruct themselves in this Mystery (yet without supposing that in effect they were ignorant of the exposition he was going to make of it) we need only call to mind what he says in his Letter to *Frudegard*, wherein speaking of the success his Book met with, I am informed, says he, that I have moved several to understand this mystery, which shews, that according to him his Book was a more clear and express exposition of the Churches sentiment, and that he had actually brought over several persons from an obscure, to a clear knowledge of this Mystery. But without going any further, we need only read a passage of *Odon Abbot of Clugny*, which Mr. Arnaud himself has produc'd; for it expressly justifies what I say, *Paschasus*, says he, has wrote these things, and several others to learn us the reverence we owe to this mystery, and make us know the majesty of it: and if those who pretend to be knowing would take the pains to read his Book, they will find such great things in it, as will make 'em acknowledg they understood little of this mystery before. After this testimony of one of *Paschasus* his principal Disciples, who lived in the 10th. Century, I think it cannot be deny'd that *Paschasus* propos'd his Doctrine by way of explication. He wrote,

wrote, says he, to teach us what reverence we owe to this mystery, and to make us know the majesty of it. He will have also the learned before the reading of this Book to be in a manner ignorant of this mystery, and seeing he is pleased the learned should be no better qualified, I hope he will pardon the ignorant by a stronger reason.

AND thus do we see on what design *Paschasus* and his Disciples taught their Opinion, to wit, as an illustration of the common Faith, an explication of what was known before but obscurely, and not as a Doctrin directly opposite to an Error with which men were imbued. I acknowledg that this design proved not successful to 'em in respect of all, and there being several who regarded this opinion as a novelty which ought to be rejected; and as to them I doubt not but *Paschasus* and his Disciples proceeded with 'em by way of opposition and contradiction, as we are wont to do against profest enemies: but how does this hinder them from proposing their Doctrin by way of explication, and even this, to wit, whether it was an exposition of the ancient Doctrin or not, was in part the subject of the contradiction.

*IT is not possible, says Mr. Arnaud, that a Doctrin should be approv'd of immediately by all those to whom it was proposed. There must certainly be some who reject it, and warn others against it.* I grant it, but that it hence follows as Mr. Arnaud would have it believed, that my pretension is impossible, is what I deny, and that with reason; for a man may well propose a new opinion by way of an explication of the ancient Faith, and defend it afterwards by way of contradiction against adversaries who reject it, and respect it as a novelty. Book 9. ch. 5.  
page 900.

*IN fine, adds Mr. Arnaud, this means will not serve the end for which Mr. Claude designs it, which is to hinder men from rising up against this Doctrin, and make the change insensible to those which suffered it.* We never told Mr. Arnaud that this means absolutely hindred the insurrection he mentions, but in effect the contrary; to wit, that several did rise up against *Paschasus*; but we pretend likewise 'twas easie to cheat several by making 'em receive this novelty, under the title of an explication, and that in their respect, they conceiv'd therein no other change than that which ignorant people do conceive, when they imagin a greater illustration of the Faith of the Church, and what those learned persons could conceive of it, mention'd by *Odon*, who by reading *Paschasus* his Book, acknowledg'd they had hitherto but small knowledg of this mystery. All the effect which this could produce was, to excite them against their former ignorance, and to esteem themselves obliged to *Paschasus* for his good instructions. Now we know that these kind of insurrections make no great noise. Ibidem.

*BUT, says moreover Mr. Arnaud, others must be surpriz'd in a contrary manner, they must needs deride the absurdity of this new Doctrin. They must be astonish'd at the boldness of Paschasus and his Disciples proposing of it as the Faith of the Church. They must be mightily offended at their being accus'd of ignorance, and infidelity for not believing that which no Body ever did believe.* Who told Mr. Arnaud there were not in effect several in *Paschasus* his time, who had these kind of sentiments touching his Opinion. *Paschasus* himself acknowledges that several called in question his Doctrin, he says he was reprehended for taking our Saviour's words in a wrong sense; he endeavours to answer some of their objections, seems to intimate he was Page 901.  
accus'd



accused for writing his Book by an Enthusiastic rashness and pretended Revelation. And in effect *John Scot, Raban, and Bertram* wrote against his novelties and opposed them. But this does not hinder its being true, that he proposed his Doctrin as an explication of the common Faith, and that this way might procure him many followers. And so far concerning the *Machins of Mellification*.

Book 9. ch. 6.  
page 902.

I come now to the pretended Machins of Execution. Mr. *Arnaud* immediately complains that I sometimes make the Real Presence to be established by the noise of Disputes; and otherwhiles acknowledg *there was no Dispute in the 10th. Century*, wherein I pretend this was effected: *I think, says he, we had best leave him to his choice, and that by choosing one of these chimerical means, he may acknowledg he has rashly and falsely offer'd the other.* Were Mr. *Arnaud's* request reasonable, we would not stick to grant it, notwithstanding the sharpness of his expressions. But 'tis unjust and unwarrantable: for 'tis certain that the change in question has hapned, and that with and without Disputes. There was a contest in the 9th. Century during the time wherein *Paschasus* lived, as I now said. We do not find there was any in the 10th. but in the 11th 'twas very hot. So that any man may see there is no contradiction in what I offered, let Mr. *Arnaud* say what he pleases. Which I hope he will grant me, when he considers, First, That what I said concerning the senses that were attackt by the noise of the Dispute, and th' Authority of the Court of *Rome*, must be referred to the 11th. Century, and that 'twill not be found I attributed it to the 10th. Secondly, That when I spoke precisely of the 10th. I did not suppose any Disputes in it, but on the contrary a gross ignorance, which hindred 'em from disputing.

Mr. *ARNAUD* cannot comprehend that there were, or that there were not any Disputes. *The means*, says he, *that they proposed the Doctrin of the Real Presence to so many persons that never heard of it, or had an averstation to it, and that they have been persuaded immediately, so that they made no resistance.* And so far for the Disputes. *The means likewise that so many Disputes should produce no Writings, that the Paschasits should publish nothing to satisfy the doubts proposed to 'em. That the Bertramits in rejecting the Doctrin of the Real Presence should never publish the reasons for it.* And here we have something against the Disputes.

BUT people must never argue against matters of fact. 'Tis certain there were Disputes against *Paschasus* his Doctrin in the 9th. Century, we learn as much from *Paschasus* himself; 'tis also certain there were likewise in the 11th. on the same subject. We are informed of this by the History of *Berenger*. It appears that the Doctrin of *Bertram* had likewise its course in the 10th. We learn this from the Paschal Homilies and Sermons of that time which are extant. 'Tis also certain the Real Presence was taught therein. We know this by th' example of *Odon* Arch-bishop of *Canterbury* who made use of Miracles to persuade the world of the truth of it. Yet does it not appear there were any Disputes rais'd on this point, nor Writings on either side. It seems to me we ought to stop here, and argue not against these matters of fact, seeing they cannot be denied; but on these facts to draw notices thence which may clear our principal Question, which is whether *Paschasus* was the Innovator, or whether th' innovation must be attributed to *John Scot*, to *Bertram*, to *Raban*, or any other adversaries of *Paschasus* his Doctrin.

This

THIS is the Point to be dispatched, for what signifies the marking one by one of the Authors that have written the lives of the Saints of the 10th. Century. What matter is it to us who wrote the life of S. Radbodus, or that of S. Godart, or S. Remacle? *We do not see*, says Mr. Arnaud, *in any of these lives that either of 'em busied himself to instruct the people in the Doctrin of the Real Presence, and to refute the contrary opinion.* Were this observation true what good would redound from it? Did these Historians design to learn the world the sentiments of their Saints on every particular Article of Religion, or to inform us what was the subject of their Sermons and instructions which they gave their people? Moreover, who supposes all these Bishops were Preachers of the Real Presence? It is sufficient there were some that have authoris'd this Doctrin, William of Malmsbury, as Mr. Arnaud himself acknowledges, relates of Odon th' Arch-bishop of Canterbury, *That he confirm'd several in the Faith that doubted of the truth of our Lords Body, having shewed them by a miracle, the Bread of the Altar changed into Flesh, and the Wine of the Chalice changed into Blood.* Whether these doubters were the Disciples of John Scot, or not, 'tis not necessary to enquire; 'tis sufficient that this relation shews us there were several persons that withstood the Doctrin of the Real Presence, and that these persons were neither inconsiderable for their number, nor fame; seeing a Primate of England, th' Arch-bishop of Canterbury was forced to make use of a Miracle for their Conversion. Mr. Arnaud likewise tells us from the Life of S. Dunstan that he preached the Real Presence; and we have seen already what he himself alledges touching Odon the Abbot of Clugny, who exhorted those that thought themselves learned to read Paschasius his Book, telling 'em they might learn such great things in it, as would make 'em acknowledg they had hitherto but small knowledge of the mystery of the Eucharist. This methinks is sufficient to shew there were endeavours in the 10th. Century to establish the Real Presence. For what could these great things be which the Learned had no knowledge of, and in which they were to be instructed by Paschasius his Book, but the mysteries of the Real Presence? 'Twould be absurd to say, that by these great things we must understand only the Devotion and Piety with which we ought to receive the Sacrament. For 'tis to be supposed, these Learned folks, mention'd by Odon were not ignorant that Jesus Christ is on the Altar by the proper substance of his Body, neither could be ignorant that it ought to be received with all the Respect and Devotion we are able; and therefore there was no need to send 'em to Paschasius his Book to discover therein this consequence, seeing it discovers it self sufficiently enough by the bare idea which the Gospel gives us of Jesus Christ.

MOREOVER, he that desires to see the strange effects of prejudice, need but read the 7th. Chapter of Mr. Arnaud's 9th. Book. He pretends to shew therein, as the title of the Chapter bears, *That the mixture of the two Doctrines which Mr. Claude is obliged to admit in the 10th. Century, is a thing the most contrary imaginable to common sense.* He exerts all his parts, to shew this mixture is impossible, he cannot endure there should be therein either ignorant or prophane persons, nor Paschasists, nor Bertramists, and argues thereupon till he has lost both himself and his Readers.

YET is this a real matter of fact against which all Mr. Arnaud's subtilties will not prevail, That the two Doctrines have been mixt in this Century. I already proved it in my Answer to the Perpetuity, but Mr. Arnaud has thought good to suppress my proofs, and pass 'em over in silence, to make

*Lib. Catholicor.  
Serm. ad Bed.  
Hist. l. 1. c. 32.  
Abraham Ve-  
loci.*

way for his reasonings. But let him argue as long as he will, he cannot hinder its being true, that in the 10th. Century th' English were taught this Doctrine, that as we consider two things in the same creature, as for instance in the water of Baptism, the one that it is naturally true 'tis corruptible Water; and th' other that according to the spiritual mystery, it has a saving virtue; so likewise if we consider th' Eucharist according to our natural understanding, we see it to be a corporeal and elementary creature; but if we regard the spiritual virtue, then we understand there is life in it, and that 'twill give immortality to those that shall partake of it with Faith. That there is a great deal of difference between the invisible virtue of this holy Eucharist, and the visible species of nature; that in respect of its nature it is corruptible Bread, and corruptible Wine, and that by the virtue of the Divine Word it is truly the Body and Blood of Christ, yet not corporeally, but spiritually. That there is a great deal of difference between this Body in which Jesus Christ has suffered, and that Body which is Consecrated in the Eucharist: For the Body with which our Saviour has suffered was born of the Virgin, has Blood, Bones, Skin, Sinews, and is indued with a reasonable Soul. But his spiritual Body which we call the Eucharist is composed of several grains, without Blood, Bones, Members, and Soul; and therefore we must not understand any thing of it corporeally, but spiritually.

*Ibidem.*

II. Mr. ARNAUD cannot hinder it from being true, that the people were instructed in this manner. The heavenly food with which the Jews were nourished by the space of forty years, and the Water which ran from the Rock, represented the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, which we now every day offer in the Church. They were the same things which we offer at this day, not corporeally, but spiritually. We have already told you that our Saviour Christ before his Passion Consecrated Bread and Wine to be his Eucharist, and said, This is my Body and Blood. He had not yet suffered, and yet he changed by his invisible virtue this Bread into his own Body, and this Wine into his own Blood, in the same manner as he had already done in the Wilderness before he was incarnate, when he changed the heavenly Manna into his Flesh, and the Water which ran from the Rock into his own Blood. He that eats my Flesh and drinks my Blood has Eternal Life. He does not command us to eat that Body which he assum'd, nor drink that Blood which he spilt for us, but by this he means the holy Eucharist, which is spiritually his Body and Blood, which whosoever shall taste with a pure heart shall live eternally. Under the ancient Law the Faithful offered to God several Sacrifices, which signified the Body of Jesus Christ to come; this Body I say which he offered to God his Father as a Sacrifice for our Sins. But this Eucharist which we now Consecrate on Gods Altar is the Commemoration of the Body of Jesus Christ offered for us, and Blood shed for us, according as he himself has commanded, saying, Do this in remembrance of me.

*Serm. Elfrici  
apud Eund.  
Voloc.*

III. Mr. ARNAUD must be remembered that Elfric Abbat of Malmesbury, and who was afterwards (as 'tis thought) Arch-bishop of Canterbury, and lived in the same time, wrote, That the Eucharist is not the Body of Jesus Christ corporally, but spiritually; not the Body in which Jesus Christ has suffered, but the Body in which he spake the night before his Passion, when he Consecrated the Bread and Wine, and said of the Consecrated Bread, This is my Body, and of the Consecrated Wine, This is my Blood, which is shed for many for the remission of sins.—The Lord who before his Passion Consecrated the Eucharist, and said, the Bread was his Body, and the Wine truly



truly his Blood, does himself every day Consecrate by the hands of the Priest the Bread into his Body, and the Wine into his Blood, by a spiritual mystery, as we find it written. This enlivening Bread is not in any sort the same Body in which our Lord suffered, and the Consecrated Wine is not the Blood of our Lord which was shed as to the corporeal matter, but it is as to the spiritual. The Bread was his Body, and the Wine his Blood, as the Bread of Heaven which we call the Manna with which the people of God were nourished during forty years, and the water which ran from the Rock in the Desert was his Blood, as says the Apostle in one of his Epistles, they ate of the same spiritual food, and drank of the same spiritual drink. The Apostle does not say corporally but spiritually. For Jesus Christ was not then born, nor his Blood spilt, when the people ate of this food, and drank of this Rock.

IV. Mr. ARNAUD cannot hinder Wulstin Bishop of Salisbury in his Sermon which he made to his Clergy, from speaking in this manner; *This Sacrifice is not the Body of Jesus Christ wherein he suffered, nor his Blood which was shed for us; but it is made spiritually his Body and Blood, as the Manna which fell from Heaven, and the water which gushed out of the Rock, according to the saying of S. Paul, I will not have you Brethren to be ignorant, that our Fathers have been all under a Cloud, and pass'd the Sea, and all of 'em baptiz'd by Moses, in the Cloud and in the Sea, and that they have all eaten the same spiritual food, and drank the same spiritual drink; for they drank out of the spiritual Rock which followed them. Now this Rock was Christ: and therefore the Psalmist says, he gave them the Bread of Heaven, Man has eaten the Angels food. We likewise without doubt eat the Bread of Angels, and drink of this Rock which signifies Christ, every time we approach with Faith to the Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ.* *Miss. in Colleg. S. Bened. Cant.*

V. Mr. ARNAUD must know that the people were publicly taught, That Jesus Christ brake the Bread to represent the fraction of his Body, that he bless'd the Bread and brake it, because it pleased him so to submit the human nature which he had taken to death, that he has also added that he had in it a treasure of Divine immortality.——And because Bread strengthens the body, and the Wine begets blood in the flesh, therefore the Bread relates mystically to the Body, and the Wine to the Blood. *In eod. Miss. Eccl. Vigorn.*

VI. He must know that Heriger Abbot of Lobbs in the County of Liege, publicly condemned Paschasius his Doctrin as new, and contrary to the Faith of the Church. Which we learn by Sigibert and the continuer of the Acts of the Abbots of Lobbs; for both of 'em say, That he produc'd against Rabbert a great many passages of the Fathers Writings touching the Body and Blood of our Lord. *Sig. de Script. Eccles. cap. 137. de Cest. Abb. Lob. tom. 6. Spicil. p. 591.*

VIII. Mr. ARNAUD himself confesses that John Scot, who withdrew into England about the end of the preceding Century, made perhaps some Disciples of his Doctrin. 'Tis true he would have these Disciples to be secret. But why secret? John Scot kept not himself private, Bertran and Raban were neither of 'em in private, Those that disliked Paschasius his Novelties hid not themselves in the 9th. Century. Why then must the Disciples of John Scot lie secret in the 10th. wherein were Homilies that were filled with Doctrins contrary to that of Paschasius publicly read? Besides, as I have already said, there's no likelihood that Odon Arch-bishop of Canterbury should think himself oblig'd to have recourse to such a famous *Book 9. ch. 6. P. 909.*

miracle as is that related by *William of Malmsbury*, to confute those that durst not shew themselves.

SEEING therefore on one hand the Doctrin of the Real Presence taught in the 10th. Century, and on the other the contrary Doctrin preached, and publickly held, it seems to me we may say with boldness that this Century was mix'd; and Mr. *Arnaud* cannot give us a greater prejudice against his way of arguing by pretended moral impossibilities than to use them in a case wherein the matter of fact so plainly appears.

*William of Tyr.*  
*lib. 1. cap. 8.*

*Fr. s. ad Con-*  
*cilium Trost.*

'TIS moreover very strange that Mr. *Arnaud* should endeavour to persuade us 'twas not possible there could be in this Century ignorant people that had no other than a confused knowledg of Gospel Mysteries; after the testimonies we have brought him of so many Authors who unanimously depose the contrary. Does he expect we will believe him sooner than *William of Tyr* an Historian of the 12th. Century, who tells us, speaking of the 10th. and 11th. *That the Christian Faith was decayed amongst those who called themselves Christians, that there were therein no more justice, equity, or any other virtue, that the world seem'd to draw towards an end, and was about returning to its former Chaos, that the lives of Church-men were no better than the peoples, for the Bishops grew negligent of their charge, were dumb dogs that could not bark.* Does he hope we shall give a greater deference to his reasons than to the testimony of *Hérivé* Arch bishop of Rheims, an Author of the 10th. Century, who assures us, that *Christian Religion was nigh decayed, and standing as it were on the edg of a precipice.* We have, says he, in the Council of Trostly, scarcely any good order observed amongst us, the whole state of the Church is overthrown and corrupted, and not to spare our selves, we that ought to correct the faults of others, are as bad as the rest; we are called Bishops, but do we do the office of a Bishop? We leave off Preaching, we behold those committed to us forsake God, and plunge themselves in all manner of lewdness, and yet are silent; we reach not forth to 'em the hand of correction. If at any time we tell 'em that which does not please 'em, they answer us in the words of our Saviour, the Scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses his seat, &c. So that in this manner are we struck dumb, and the Lords flock is lost, are drowned in vices, and exposed to the cruel teeth of wolves. There being no body to shew 'em the way of life, how can it be but they must wander into the paths of error? Thus in them is accomplished what is said by the Prophet, *This ignorant people shall be struck with jealousy; and again, My people are gone into captivity, because they had no knowledg. Where are they who are converted by our Preaching and have brought forth fruits worthy of repentance? Who is the man that by hearing us has left his luxury, covetousness, or pride?*

*Concilium*  
*Trost, cap. 3.*

This good Bishop who deserves without doubt for his zeal not to be comprehended amongst the number of others, describing in a decretal of his Council assembled at Trostly the condition of the Monasteries of his time, says, *That as well the Monks as the Nuns lived without Rule, and Discipline, applying themselves to worldly affairs; that some of 'em were constrained by necessity to return into the world again, that the Monasteries were possess'd by Lay-Abbots who lived therein with their Wives, Children, Soldiers and Dogs; that the Abbots were not in a capacity to examine the Rules of their Convents, to read, or understand 'em; and if at any time the Book was offer'd 'em, their reply was, Nescio literas.* He afterwards represents the violence of those that

that ravish'd the goods of the Church, persecuted, and put to death the Priests, forcibly took away their Neighbors Estates, laying snares for the innocent, putting 'em to death and plundering their houses, and says the number of these latter was infinite, and that they imagin'd 'twas a gentile thing to live by Rapine. Afterwards he turns his discourse to the Ravishers of Virgins, and Women, and those that contracted clandestine and incestuous Marriages, and shews the number of these was not small. Thence he comes to the scandalous conversation of Priests with Women, to perjured Persons, Quarrels, Murthers; and in fine, concludes by an exhortation to the Bishops his Suffragans to do henceforward their duty. *Alas*, says he, *ibid. in Epl.* *alas! thro our negligence, and ignorance, and by the neglect and ignorance of our Predecessors, and that of our Brethren who are still living, several do perish in their Vices, and at this time there are an infinite number of people of both Sexes, Ages, and Conditions, ignorant of the Faith, know not their Creed; or Pater noster. How can these people, supposing they were of honest conversation, do good Works, having not the foundation of Faith? And what excuse can we make for our selves? when they die they enter not into life, for they are unacquainted with it, but they enter into eternal death, which they cannot avoid, being without Faith; for the just live by Faith. We are then, as Gregory says, the murderers of these people that perish, whereas we should be their guides to save them. For 'tis for our sins this multitude are degenerated, because we carelessly neglect the giving them the instructions of life. Will Mr. Arnaud now persuade us 'twas impossible there should be persons in the 10th. Century that had only a confused knowledg of Christianity?*

*THE ignorance*, says he, *of the mystery of the Eucharist cannot subsist with a million of Preachers of the Real Presence, and a million of people that rejected it.* When Mr. Arnaud is in his Closter, a million of Preachers costs him no more than thirty; and his Commission is as soon given to a great number as a small. But what is most admirable, is, that when we come to count these Preachers of the Real Presence, we do not find 'em to be above four or five at most; one of which, as I already observed, plainly tells us, that those of his time that personated learned men had small knowledg of this mystery, till they read *Paschasius* his Book, which must be according to him the fountain of their light. 'Tis moreover to be observed that what I now alledged of *Hérivé* in the Council of *Trossy*, is of the year 909. that is to say, in the beginning of the 10th. Century. Now it is certain the darkness waxed greater after this Century, but we see to what degree it arrived then. Most of the Abbats knew not how to read. The Pastors left off Preaching 'to and instructing of the people; and an infinite number of people of either Sex, both young and old, could not say their Creed, nor the Lords Prayer during their whole lives. Methinks it cannot be well concluded hence there were at that time in the Church neither ignorant nor prophane persons; much less can it be concluded hence, there were then but three sorts of persons, the *Paschasists*, the *Bertramists*, and those that pass'd from one opinion to another. 'Tis sufficient, says Mr. Arnaud, to tell Mr. Claude in a word, that to act as he must suppose they have done, they must not have been men, but some other kind of Animals, and such creatures as we never heard of. To which I answer, that if he will not allow 'em to be Men, he shall make Satyrs, or Centaurs of 'em if he will: for as to my part I must suppose 'em to be what they are. If he does not find the *Paschasists* had zeal enough for the Real Presence, he ought to impart more to 'em if he can. And if the *Bertramists* have not well discharged their duty,



we for our share must deplore their stupidity, seeing we cannot help it. But howsoever 'tis certain there were *Paschabiffs*, and that there were *Bertramiffs*; and 'tis likewise as certain that the Pastors carelessness, and the Peoples ignorance were both very great. These are matters of fact, against which 'tis in vain to dispute. All that can be rationally said, is, that the ignorance of the one, and the carelessness of the others made 'em agree in the subject of the Real Presence. I mean they disputed not about it, because they wanted ability to do it, as well as zeal and industry.

Book 9. ch. 9.  
Page 957.

Mr. ARNAUD endeavours in vain to persuade us that the disorders of the 10th. Century were no greater than those of the others, and that the state of the Church in this world is to include in the same external Society both living and dead Members, Stubble and Wheat; 'tis a necessary consequence of this state, that a man may reproach every Age with several disorders, and that each time of the Church may be respected as having two different faces, according as a man casts his eyes upon the good that credit it, or the wicked that dishonour it.

WHAT he says is but too true, and so 'tis too true that the 10th. Century has improved the former errors; for besides that the common disorders have appeared in it in a different degree, there were particular ones in it which the preceding Ages were not acquainted with. Never was there such an ignorance before which the Council of *Troly* then denoted. The neglect of the Bishops and Priests was never so great as that Council, *Elfric* Arch-bishop of *Canterbury*, and *William* of *Tyre* describe it. Covetousness never reigned so much amongst the Monks and Priests, as *Polydor Virgil* testifies it did then. Such an universal degeneracy, as we find attributed by Authors to those times, we never yet heard of. There were never seen in the Church of *Rome* the like disorders as those that were observable throughout this whole Century. Such a relaxation of Discipline in the Cathedral Churches (the superintendency of which was committed to Children of 5, 10, 12, and 14 years) was never before known. Most Writers that have mention'd it are Historians that design'd not to pass censures, or aggravate in general the degeneracy of men, but to remark the particular characters of this Century which distinguish them from the rest. And therefore they call it the unhappy Age, an Age of lead, the iron Age, an obscure and dark Age, an Age of darkness and ignorance, a most wretched time wherein the just were not to be found, and wherein truth had forsaken the earth, an Age, in short, wherein hapned a general decay of all virtues.

Book 9. ch. 7.  
Page 947.

'TIS in vain for Mr. Arnaud to say again, 'twas an Age of Zeal, Fervour, Conversions, Reformations in Princes, in Princesses, in Bishops, in Religious Persons, and in the People. For first, 'tis certain that in respect of those which Mr. Arnaud speaks of, that their Zeal, their Fervour, their Conversions, their Reformations, such as they were had not that prevalency as to make 'em dispute amongst themselves of the Real Presence. On one hand was taught, as we have already observed, That there's a great difference between this Body in which Jesus Christ suffered, and that which is Consecrated in the Eucharist; that the one is born of the Virgin, has Blood, Bones, Skin, Nerves, and is endued with a reasonable Soul; but that the other which is his spiritual Body consists of several grains, without Blood, Bones, Members, and Soul. That as in the Water of Baptism there are two things to be considered, one that according to nature 'tis corruptible water, and the other ac-  
cording

cording to the spiritual mystery, this water has a salutary virtue; so the Eucharist according to the natural understanding is a corporeal and corruptive creature, and according to the spiritual virtue, life is in it, it gives immortality to the Faithful. 'Twas taught, that the Bread and Wine are spiritually changed into the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, as the Manna was changed into his Flesh, and the water of the Rock into his Blood. That the Bread is not in any wise the same Body in which our Saviour suffered, nor the Wine the Blood which he shed for us, but his Body and Blood spiritually. In this Age were several passages of the Fathers collected and urged against Paschasius touching the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ. On the other hand the Pastors were exhorted to come and learn in Paschasius his Book what they were as yet ignorant of. Miracles were likewise wrought to confirm those that doubted of the Real Presence; but we do not find they disputed about it one against another. If the reason which I offer from the ignorance, and negligence of the one and the other does not well relish with Mr. Arnaud, let him give a better, I'll gladly receive it, provided he denies not certain matters of fact, against which no arguments must be offered.

THE Zeal, Fervour, Conversions and Reformations which he attributes to the 10th. Century, hinder not the truth of what we observed concerning the Religious living without Rule, their Abbots being married and Lay-men, the Bishops neglecting to instruct their Flocks, and an infinite number of either Sex and all Ages, being ignorant of the Creed and Lords Prayer, and living and dying in this ignorance. This is a matter of fact attested by Witnesses of that very Age. This does not hinder but the Roman Church was for this whole Century in a fearful disorder, as speaks the Author of the Perpetuity, and Baronius too when he tells us, *Our Saviour Christ slept then in his Ship. He slept and made as tho he saw not these things, he let them alone, he arose not to take vengeance; and that which was worse, there were no Disciples who by their shrieks should awake the Lord sleeping, for they were all asleep themselves. What think you were the Cardinals, Priests, and Deacons that were elected by these Monsters, seeing there's nothing more natural than for every thing to produce its like. Who doubts but they consented to all which they did who had chosen 'em, but that they imitated 'em and trod in their footsteps, but that they all desired our Saviour should sleep on, and never rise to judg them, nor awake to call 'em to account for their wicked deeds.* Luitprand produces a Letter of John the XIIth. to the Council, which the Emperor Otton assembled at Rome to depose him, which shews us how admirable the Popes were for Learning in those days. *Joannes Episcopus servus servorum Dei omnibus Episcopis. Nos audivimus dicere quod vos vultis alium Papam facere, si hoc feceritis, Excommunico vos de Deo omnipotenti, ut non habeatis licentiam ullum ordinare & missam celebrare.* The Councils answer is as elegant. *Est vestris in literis scriptum quod non Episcopum sed puerilem ineptiam scribere deceret, excommunicastis enim omnes ut non habeamus licentiam canendi missam, ordinandi Ecclesiasticas dispositiones, si alium Romanæ Sedi constitueremus Episcopum. Ita enim scriptum erat, non habeatis licentiam ullum ordinare. Nunc usque putavimus, immo credimus duo negativa unum facere dedicativum, nisi vestra autoritas priorum sententias infirmaret autorum.*

Bayon. annal.  
Eccles. Tom 10.  
ad ann. 612.

THE Zeal, Fervour, frequent Conversions, and Reformations of those days could not hinder but that Symony was very frequent, as I proved in my Answer to the Perpetuity by the testimonies of Luitprand, and Glaber, and

Baron. ad ann.  
925.

and by the very confession of the Author of the *Perpetuity* himself, which might be further made to appear were it necessary. Now judg I pray you what science and zeal there could be in a Church where the ministerial Office was upon sale to him that offered most. And moreover, the Arch-bishopricks, and Bishopricks commonly bestowed on Children incapable of discharging those great trusts; which *Baronius* expressly asserts: for having told us from the testimony of *Frodoart* that *Heribert* Earl of *Guyenne* and *Süelphus* Arch-bishop of *Rhemes* were agreed, that after the death of *Süelphus* the Arch-bishoprick should come to *Heribert's* Son, he says, that *Heribert* to make quick work caused *Süelphus* to be poisoned, and his Son to be chosen in his place, who was not above five years old; that the news of the Election being brought to the King, he confirm'd it, which was also done by Pope *John* the Xth. To which *Baronius* adds, That this example was quickly followed by several Princes, who promoted their own or relations Children to the Episcopal Seats as oft as they became vacant, which, says he, was likewise done in Rome it self in those days, Constantinople, and other great Cities. And would to God, adds he, this custom had went no farther than those days, and that so detestable a wickedness against the Churches Canons were unknown to the following Ages. Let Mr. *Arnaud* himself judg whether ignorance, and carelessness are not the natural effects of such disorders.

WHEREUNTO we may add the Tumults and continual Wars with which the West was afflicted during this whole Century; for 'tis certain that from the beginning to the end of it all Europe resounded with the noise of them. France was therein troubled by the League of *Robert*, and the dreadful consequences hapning thereupon, by the Wars against the Normans, Danes, and Germans, and by those which hapned upon the rejection of *Charles* Duke of *Lorraine*, and th' Election of *Hugo Capet*. England was therein disturb'd by divers Civil Wars, and the frequent Incurfions of the Danes, Scotch, Irish, and other people still professing Paganism. Spain was also molested by the Moors, Arabians, and Saracens, by the Invasions of the Normans, and by the dreadful Divisions of the Christians.

GERMANY spent this Century in perpetual Confusions, the Danes, Sclavonians, and Huns ravag'd all things by their irruptions which often hapned. For Children to contrive the death of their Parents was ordinary, and Great Persons to rise up against their lawful Princes, (which commonly ended in bloody Battels) not to mention the cruel Wars which the Emperors had to maintain in Italy against the Factious, and in Calabria against the Greeks and Saracens.) As to Italy she was throughout this whole Century, in the most deplorable state imaginable; on one hand by the Princes of *Tuscany*, on the other by the Wars of the Italian Princes one against another, and the Arms of the Emperors and neighboring Kings. In short, the confusions were then so general, that there was scarcely a corner in Europe wherein a man that loves quiet could obtain it. Now who is it but knows that times of War and Divisions are apt to introduce carelessness, looseness, and ignorance of the mysteries of Religion into the Church.

I CONFESS there were in this Age some endéavours after a Reformation; bu besides that they were but mere essays that proved ineffectual, I deny they were strong enough, supposing they could have had a wished for success, to stir men up to search into the Controversie of Christs Real Presence in the Sacrament. The most considerable were those made

in



in the Council of *Troisy* already mention'd by us, and it will not be amiss to make some remarks on what was resolv'd therein. *Let us endeavour,* Council. Trois.  
Epilogo. say these Fathers which were not above twelve) *by our own means and by the Priests under us, to avoid as much as in us lies, this terrible damnation, which we have drawn down upon our selves and the people committed to our charge. Let us instruct 'em both by our Doctrin and Example. Let us behave our selves as the Ministers of Christ, that our Office be not dishonored, and 'it be said of us, the Priests are without knowledg, those to whom the Law is committed have not known me, and lest we fall into the fault of Ely who corrected not the faults of his Sons. First then let every Christian ground himself well in the Christian Religion, which is the Catholick Faith, without which a man cannot be called a Christian. Let him believe in the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, one only true God, three persons in unity of substance. But yet know that the Son alone took on him our Flesh to save us, and thus suffered Death, rose again, ascended up into Heaven, and will come in the same Flesh to judg both quick and dead: Let him believe in the Holy Ghost, and that by him we have the remission of sins in our Baptism, and that thro his Grace our sins are continually pardon'd by the penitence and ministry of the Priests. Let him believe also a real and general Resurrection of the Flesh at the coming of Jesus Christ. This is the true foundation of Faith which must be adorned by Good Works; for as 'tis impossible without Faith to please God, so Faith cannot be perfect if it shews not it self by Charity, for if it be void of works it's become dead in it self. They afterwards proceed to the rules of morality, recommending Hope, Charity, Humility, Chastity, Temperance, Sobriety, and condemn Pride, Envy, Hatred, Variance, Drunkenness, Calumny, Magick, Divinations, &c.*

HERE we have without question very commendable endeavours, but they reach no farther than the instructing of the people in the Articles of the Creed and the principal points of morality. These Fathers in their greatest zeal to reform both themselves and others, make no mention of the Real Presence. 'Twas not then above fifty years when the Dispute was very hot on this subject, and Books were wrote on both sides. Yet it seems they took no notice of it, much less determin to instruct the people in what they ought to hold of it. All their care was to remove that ignorance of the Fundamentals wherein the people lay, and correct that fearful corruption of manners wherein the greatest parr spent their lives. Now this shews us that Mr. Arnaud can draw no advantage from these essays of a Reformation, for supposing they had their whole effect, they extended not so far as the question of the Real Presence, because they suppose either that the people were not ignorant of it, or that the Pastors were themselves so persuaded of it, that 'twas needless to instruct them in it, or exhort them to instruct their Flocks in it. But what likelihood is there that this innumerable multitude of people of both Sexes, and of all Ages and conditions of life, that knew not their Creed, nor the Lords Prayer, and lived without any knowledg of the Principles of Christian Religion should know the Doctrin of the Real Presence. Were they all in those days born imbued with this Doctrin? What likelihood is there those Abbots that knew not the Statutes of their Monasteries, and who to excuse themselves from reading 'em when offered to them, were forced to say, *nescimus literas*, were not likewise greatly ignorant of the Mystery of the Eucharist? What reason is there to say the Pastors themselves were commonly instructed in it, seeing Odon Abbot of Clugny, as we have already seen, testifies that those who

pretended to be learned yet had little knowledg of the Sacrament till they read *Paschasius* his Book.

T H E R E were likewise other Reformations made in this Century, but they served only to establish some order in the Monasteries, and the observance of particular Statutes under which the Religious are obliged to live by their profession; and this does not hinder but that ignorance and carelessness were very great in respect of the Mystery of Religion.

A S to the Conversions, 'tis certain there were some, but Mr. *Arnaud* knows very well the greatest part of 'em were wrought by force, or the interests and intrigues of Princes. And thus those that were converted might well embrace their Religion implicitly or in gross, without troubling themselves with particular Doctrins, as the greatest part of the People of the Roman Church do at present. In the year 912, according to *Matthew of Westminster*, *Rollon*, or *Raoul*, Duke of *Normandy* embraced the Christian Religion to espouse *Gill* the Daughter or Sister of *Charles III.* King of *France*. In the year 925, *Sitricus* King of *Denmark* caused himself to be Baptised to espouse *Edgite* the Sister of *Ætelslan* King of *England*, but a while after he returned to Paganism. In the year 926, *Elstan* having vanquish'd in Battle several petty Kings which were then in *England*, obliged them and their Subjects to receive the Christian Faith. In the year 949, *Otton* King of *Germany* having subdued the *Slavonians*, these people redeemed their lives and Country by being Baptiz'd. In the year 965, *Poland* was converted to the Christian Faith by the Marriage of *Miezislaus* its King with the Daughter of *Boleslaus* Duke of *Bohemia*. *John XIII.* Anti-Pope to *Benedict V.* sent thither *Gilles* Bishop of *Tusculum* to establish under the Authority of the King his Religion in that Country. In the year 989, *Adalbert* Archbishop of *Prague* went into *Hungary* to endeavour the conversion of those people; but this was under the authority and power of *Geisa* King of *Hungary*, who was converted by commerce with Christians whom he freely permitted to live in his Kingdom. So that all these conversions about which Mr. *Arnaud* and the Author of the *Perpetuity* make such a noise to advance the glory, zeal, and knowledg of the Bishops of the 10th. Century do not at all conclude what they pretend.

L E T the Reader then joyn all these things together, and judg which of us two has most reason, Mr. *Arnaud* who maintains it to be impossible that the belief of the Real Presence, supposing 'twere a novelty in the Church, could make any progress therein in the 10th. Century without Disputes and Commotions, or I who maintain that these progresses were not only possible, but easie to be conceiv'd. First, There were Disputes on this subject in the 9th. Century, which is a matter of fact not to be denied. Secondly, Altho the question was therein agitated, yet was it not decided by any Council, nor by the Church of *Rome*, nor by any other publick Authority. Thirdly, Those of the 10th. Century fell into a very confused knowledg of the Mystery of Christian Religion, in general, the People, the Religious, and the greatest part of the Priests and Bishops, lived in very gross ignorance, and in a prodigious neglect of the chief Offices of their Charge, as we have fully proved. Fourthly, Ecclesiastical Discipline was wholly laid aside in this Age, and the temporal state of the Church lay in a perpetual and general confusion. Fifthly, It appears that the Doctrin of *Bertram* which was contrary to the Real Presence was therein preached in several places.

places. Sixthly, It also appears that that of *Paschasius* was so too, and was endeavour'd to be under-propt by Miracles; and Pastors exhorted to read *Paschasius* his Book to be instructed in the Mystery of the Eucharist. Seventhly, To which we may add, that the persons that taught the Real Presence in this Century were people of great credit and authority: *Odon* that confirm'd it by Miracles was Archbishop of *Canterbury*, and was in great reputation. The other *Odon* who had such an esteem for *Paschasius* his Book was an Abbot of *Clugny*, a restorer and reformer of several Monasteries, of whom *Baronius* says, *That he was chosen by God as another Jeremiah* Baron. ad an. 538. *to pluck up, destroy, scatter, plant and build in that wretched Age.*

ALL these matters of fact being clearly proved as they are, what impossibility is there that the Doctrine of *Paschasius* (which he taught in the 9th. Century, as an explication of the true Doctrine of the Church, confirming it as much as he could by several passages of the Fathers taken in a wrong sense, no publick Authority having condemn'd it) should have followers in the 10th. That these his Disciples finding themselves credited and authoris'd by their Offices and Employs in a Church wherein ignorance, carelessness, and confusion reign'd, have themselves communicated and dispers'd it in the minds of several, without resistance; and thus this Doctrine has made in the space of these hundred years insensible progresses, establishing it self by little and little under the name and title of the Churches Faith, till having been at length directly and formally contradicted in the 11th. as an innovation, this Doctrine found it self the strongest; and triumph'd over the contrary Doctrine. What difficulty can be rais'd against this Hypothesis, which may not be easily solved? If it be said that *Paschasius* did not propose any thing but what all the faithful already distinctly knew and believed, *Paschasius* himself will answer for me, that he has moved several persons to the understanding of this Mystery, which supposes that before his time 'twas not sufficiently known; and that he discovered things of which the people were ignorant. *Odon* will answer for me that the most learned had but little knowledge of the mystery of the Eucharist if they had not read *Paschasius* his Book. If it be said his Doctrine met with no contradiction, *Paschasius* himself will tell you that some blamed him for attributing more to the word of Christ than the truth it self has promised us, and 'tis hereon he disputes against his Adversaries. Should a man deny that the two Doctrins, that of *Paschasius*, and that of his Adversaries were both taught in the 10th. Century, he will (I think) be convinced of the contrary by the proofs I have given; and in effect there's no great likelihood that the Doctrine of *John Scot*, and *Bertram*, who wrote by the command of King *Charles the Bald of France*, and that of *Raban*, three persons of great note in the Church, should be thus extinct in so short a time, without any Councils condemning it, without the Court of *Rome* concerning her self with it, without the interposition of temporal Princes, and that there should, I say, remain no trace of it in the 10th. Century. He that shall think it strange that the people of the 10th. Century have taken for the Faith of the Church that which was in effect an innovation; need only call to mind the ignorance wherein the people lived; for when a man does not know what the Church believes, 'tis no hard matter for him to be deceived, and to take that which she does not believe for what she does. That man that questions this ignorance need only for his conviction to read the proofs I have given of it. Should any man alledg it to be strange such men as an Archbishop of *Canterbury* and an Abbot of *Clugny* should be deceived, 'tis easie



to shew the weakness of this objection by th' example of several that are men of better parts than those now in question, who now take for the Doctrin of the Church what is not so. The Disciples of *Paschasius* found in his Book such specious Arguments as deceiv'd 'em, and 'tis a thing ordinary enough to be surprized by false colours. Should it be said to be impossible but that the Disciples of *Paschasius* (knowing *Bertram's* Doctrin was taught in several places) have openly condemned it and disputed against those that held it. First, I answer, I do not know whether we may absolutely say there was no dispute about it, for there may be disputes and we not know of 'em; but supposing there were not? I answer, that seeing 'tis no Miracle that disputation should cease sometimes in an enlightned Age, amongst learned and zealous men, without any Conversions on either side, 'tis much less one in a dark and troublesom Age wherein persons thought of nothing less than disputing. The Disciples of *Paschasius* thought they were oblig'd to be contented in recommending the reading of *Paschasius* his Book to all persons; and in confirming their Opinion by Miracles. If it be likewise said that those that followed the Doctrin of *Bertram* ought to dispute against those that follow'd that of *Paschasius*, I must say so too, but that men do not do always what they are oblig'd to do, because they have not always that zeal, knowledg, or industry which they ought to have. How should they dispute one against another, who left for the most part their Flocks without Pasture, without Instruction, without Preaching. Howsoever, this is as I said a thing certain, that there were persons in this Century, who held the Doctrin of *Paschasius*, and others that of *Bertram*. Whether they disputed or no, it concerns me not to know; 'tis sufficient for me that this Age held both these Doctrins, which I think cannot be denied. When two opposite Doctrins are taught, and both as the true Faith of the Church in an Age of Ignorance, to speak after the manner of men, and according to the terms of our Dispute, 'tis equally impossible either of them should get the upper hand; because they want that understanding which is requisite to make aright judgment: and moreover, if the one be asserted by persons of Authority and great Reputation, it is almost impossible but this will carry it away from the other. Whence it follows the progress of the Real Presence in the 10th. Century has been not only possible, but easie, and even unavoidable. To which, if we add another matter of fact, which is that we do not find there were Disputes in this Century on this subject; whence we will conclude that these progresses we speak of have been made in an insensible manner, at least in our respect, which is to say, that if there were any noise or contests, the knowledg of 'em never came to us, which suffices to decide the question between us two.

AND this is what I had to say touching the state of the 10th. Century in respect of Transubstantiation and the Real Presence. I take no notice of those violent accusations which Mr. *Arnaud* brings against our Morals, under pretence we do not reckon Piety to consist in affected Penances, and outward Mortifications, which for the most part have more shew than substance. We praise and recommend as earnestly as we can the practice of Fasting, but believe it better to abstain from Vice than Meats; the use of which God has given us with sobriety. We believe every man ought to be content with the condition wherein God has placed him, to make good use of his Estate, and endure Poverty without envy, murmurings, and repinings; to live holily in Celibacy, and chastly in Marriage; to carry ourselves justly to our Inferiors, and obediently to Superiors. But we do not approve

approve of mens withdrawing themselves out of that rank and order wherein providence has placed them, nor making of particular rules, and binding men to th' observance of 'em by Vows, nor that the Rich should ransom their sins by great offerings to Ecclesiastical persons who have no need of 'em, nor of Voluntary Poverty, much less that men should imagin to satisfy the Almighty for their sins, and merit any thing of him by these kind of observances, 'Tis not from *Seneca* we have learn'd this Divinity, but *S. Paul*. This great Doctor would not have us to be concerned for these things, which he calls *Commandments and Doctrins of men*, which says he, *have some appearance of wisdom in a voluntary devotion and humility of spirit, and in that they spare not in any kind the flesh*. Let Mr. *Arnaud* extol as much as he pleases the glory of the 10th. Century by these mortifications, he shall never persuade reasonable people that an age wherein appears on one hand an almost universal ignorance of all that is good, a prodigious neglect of the mysteries of Religion, an almost universal corruption of manners, a strange kind of Devotion to all manner of Vices, a deplorable relaxation of Ecclesiastical Discipline; and on the other several Monasteries founded, and outward austerity practis'd, that this could be an Age of *Benediction and Grace*.

MOREOVER, what we have said of *Edgar* King of *England*, *Dunstan* Archbishop of *Canterbury*, and the quarrel of the Ecclesiastics in *England*, has been grounded on good Testimonies. *William of Malmsbury* tells us *Edgar* was reproached for dishonoring the first years of his Reign with Cruelties, and strange Pollutions, one of which was that being enamored with the Wife of *Etelwold* his Favorite, he got him out one day into the Forrest to Hunt, and there caused him to be cruelly murder'd. Another of his wickednesses was the forcibly carrying away a Maid that he loved, who to avoid his pursuits had cast her self into a Monastery, and taken therein the Vail. Another time falling in love with a Dukes Daughter, and having given orders to have her brought to him, the Mother who would not consent her Daughter should be dishonored, substituted one of her Maids in her place, who was also very fair; which *Edgar* understanding, he was thereat so enraged that he changed their rank and quality, and made this Servant Mistress over her own Mistress. He a while after espoused *Elfride*, the Widow of his Favorite, whom he had caused to be slain.

IT is said that *Dunstan* Excommunicated him, because he had violated the respect due to a Monastery, and drew out thence a Woman who wore the Habit of a Religious, altho she was none, and abused her. *It's certain*, *Guilliel. Malm. lib. 2. c. 8.* says he, that *Wulfritte* (for this was the Maids name) was not a Nun but a Laick, who fearing the King, had taken the Vail, which the King snatching from her abused her. At which *Dunstan* being offended in that he dared to lust after a person that had only the Umbra of Religion, made use of his Pontifical power against him. Now as we must judge of the zeal of *Dunstan* from the Historians own words; so we cannot but say there was a great deal of hypocrisy in this action; for is it not an horrible hypocrisy to have less regard to the Sacrament of Baptism, an Ordinance instituted by God himself, than to this human institution. *William of Malmsbury* represents *Dunstan* displaying all his Pontifical Power to revenge the outrage offer'd to the shadow of Religion, *Unde offensum*, says he, *beatum Dunstanum quod illam concupisset quæ vel umbraticè sanctimonialis fuisset, vigorem pontificalem in eum egisse*, of the Consecration of Baptism, or the enormity of the acti-

on he says never a word. Let not Mr. Arnaud take it ill that I call this hypocritic. He says my censure is unjust, because this Maid was Baptiz'd, and so Edgar had violated in her the character and the consecration of Baptism as well as in the others. But what signifies this remark? This Maid was Baptiz'd without doubt; and for that reason we esteem it ill that Dunstan grounded his severity, and his Episcopal fury on a bare shadow of Religion without any notice of her Baptism.

Polydor. Virg.  
Hist. Ang. l. 6.

AS to the quarrel of the Ecclesiasticks and Monks in England, I have said nothing but what is grounded on the testimony of Polydor Virgil, as appears by what I related in my Answer to the Perpetuity. The Historian lays it upon the insatiable covetousness of the Monks, neither does he excuse the Priests from the same charge; and as to the image of the Crucifix that spake, he says expressly *there were several people of good report that believed it was rather an Oracle of Phæbus, than an Oracle of God; which is to say, that this voice was uttered not by the will of God, but by the fraud of men.* What I also said that their disputations were not concerning the Gospel, that they were all agreed to let that rest without understanding it, without preaching it, and without reading it is grounded on the testimony of Elfric Archbishop of Canterbury, who lived at the same time, for he was Primate of England in the year 989, a year after the death of Dunstan, according to the report of Matthew of Westminster. *In these days, says Elfric, the Priests and Bishops are become so careless and idle, who ought to be the Pillars of the Church, that they regard not the holy Scriptures, nor instruct Disciples that may become their Successors: as we find several Holy men did who left behind 'em several good Disciples. Their minds are more taken up with worldly Honors, Concupiscence and Covetousness than the Laicks: and what a sad example do they give their Flocks, not daring to speak of Justice, because they neither love it, nor observe it.*

Elfric Ser. ad  
Sacerd. Miss.  
in Bibl. Colleg.  
S. Bened. Cant.

## C H A P. VII.

Mr. Arnaud's Objections against what he terms *Machins of Forgetfulness, Examined.* The Examples of the insensible Changes alledg'd in answer to the Perpetuity, Defended.

Answer to the  
second Treat.  
ch. 1.

I SAID in my Answer to the Perpetuity, That if we had this Dispute with Greeks or Egyptians we should not perhaps take it ill for them to ask us how this change was wrought; but we cannot bear without some kind of regret and vexation these same Transubstantiators, this very party that made the change, who have used a thousand tricks insensibly to effect it, that have made use of Fraud and Violence, to hinder its being wrought with noise, that have taken infinite care to deprive posterity of the knowledge of the manner how 'twas done, to come now to us and demand how this could be.

Book 9. ch. 8.  
page 573.

WHEREUPON Mr. Arnaud tells us first, That we have in effect to do with not only Egyptians and Greeks, but likewise Moscovites, Ethiopians, Nestorians, Jacobites, Armenians and Indians; that all these people make the same



same questions as the Author of the Perpetuity, and require the same satisfaction. But that Mr. Claude cannot answer 'em, seeing they had no Paschasus, nor Popes, nor Monks, nor Councils, nor Croisados, nor Inquisitors to work this Establishment. In the second place he says that I am unjust in accusing the Catholics of this Age for making the change in question, and employing Croisados and Inquisitors against us. That these are not the same persons that were in the 10th. Century, and that as to his part he has made use neither of Cheats nor Artifices to hinder this change's being made with noise. Page 954.

THE first of these Answers is already refuted. We have nothing to do either with Greeks, or Egyptians, Moscovites, Ethiopians, Nestorians, Jacobites, Armenians, nor Indians in the affair of Transubstantiation. Mr. Arnaud puts questions to us about them without their consent or order. The Doctrin of Transubstantiation has been a long time insinuating of it self amongst 'em, which when effected we shall have the Emissaries and Scholars of the Seminaries to be Witnesses of th' Innovation.

THE second Answer is frivolous. We neither accuse Mr. Arnaud nor his Friends personally for having done any thing to deprive us of the knowledge of the manner in which the change hapned: whatsoever they have thereunto contributed consists only in the false Citations, and Sophisms in their Books, but of these we will not here complain. We only complain here of their drawing advantage from the ill means that have been used by other persons on their side, whose Successors and Defenders they are, to deprive Posterity of the knowledge of th' Innovation in question, and I believe there's a great deal of Justice in this complaint. A Council has caused John Scot's Book to be burn'd, there are none to be had of 'em at this day. We have lost the Writings of Heribald Bishop of Auxerre, the Letter of Raban to Egilon, Eriger's Book against Paschasus, Berenger's Works, their Books who wrote in his favour in the 11th. Century. We know no more of this long History than what we can gather here and there in suspected Authors Adversaries to Berengarius and his Doctrin. Moreover there have been given the publick under the name of the Fathers false and supposed Books: their real Works have been alter'd, and false pieces inserted in them to make the world believe there were no Innovations in their Doctrin. I say nothing but what may be easily justified, and which I have already clearly proved elsewhere. If I complain of Mr. Arnaud's injustice who makes advantage of these frauds put upon us, and which he knows to be such, in like manner as what the Emissaries have done in the East, whence he would make us believe they of those parts have ever held Transubstantiation and the Real Presence. This is I think a complaint for which no rational person will condemn me. Answer to Nouet.

I likewise propos'd some examples of insensible changes which have hapned in the Latin Church, whence I concluded 'twas not impossible one should have hapned by the introduction of the Doctrins of Transubstantiation and the Real Presence. Mr. Arnaud to extricate himself out of the perplexity which these examples caused him, has devised some distinctions, some of 'em imaginary, and others unnecessary, by means whereof he has pretended to invalidate the change in question, and they are these differences which we must now examine.

IT cannot be denied but that the custom of communicating of both kinds, that of giving the Communion to little Children, and that of Fast-ing till the Evening, and some others have been chang'd in the Latin Church. Mr. Arnaud does not gain-say it, but tells us these customs are still used in the Eastern Churches, so that the change has not been vniver-sal, whereas if that of the establishment of Transubstantiation were true, *we must suppose it hapned at the same time throughout all the world, and all Christian Churches.* This is his first difference which he amplifies and ex-aggerates after his manner. But the answer is not difficult, to wit, that there is not any Transubstantiation or Real Presence, such as the Roman Church holds in the Eastern Churches, or if there be, 'tis brought in by the Emislaries and Scholars of the Romish Seminaries: besides that a change is not ever the less insensible in respect of those that have admitted it, for its being less universal.

THE second difference is, that in the greatest part of th' expressions which I propose the point concerns some establish'd custom, whereas here the question is touching a new Doctrin universally establish'd, *which is,* says he, *extremely different, a general inconveniency may universally abolish a custom; but when the question is touching the remedying of an abuse every man follows his particular judgment in the choice of remedies.* And this especially shews us th' impossibility of the change in the subject of the Eucharist. For this must be said to be an universal establishment of an extraordinary Doctrin which cannot subsist with the infinite diversity of judgments, respects and inclinations which happen in so many different Churches, which being divided in such small matters, cannot be expected to unite in a Doctrin so offensive that 'tis strange it has found any followers, neither could it, had it not been authoriz'd by an universal consent.

I confess there's a great deal of difference betwixt an ancient custom that is abolish'd, and a new Doctrin that is establish'd. But this difference does Mr. Arnaud more hurt than good. For ignorant people are more earnest to conserve their customs which they know, than they are to reject a Doctrin which they know but imperfectly, and concerning whose novelty they cannot judge. When an ancient publick and perpetual custom is abolish'd, th' innovation is more manifest than when a new Doctrin is intro-duc'd, for the novelty of it is conceal'd, 'tis offer'd as being the ancient Faith; and they that offer it pervert for this effect some ordinary expressions, turning 'em into another sense. Customs are of themselves popular, and when they are changed, people are apt to imagin their Religion is about being taken away from 'em: but as to Doctrinals, the people are wont to suffer those that have greatest authority in the Church to preach what they please, and obediently receive it without any examination. As to the rest, 'tis certain there has hapned something in reference to the Eucharist, which is like what Mr. Arnaud observes, that when we leave an ancient custom every man takes a different course, and follows his own particular judgment. For the Latins and Greeks in departing from the plain and genuine explication of the Ancients, which was, that the Bread and Wine of the Eucharist are figures and images of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, have fallen upon different sentiments, the Greeks having taken the party of the union of the Bread with the Divinity, and augmentation of the Body of Jesus Christ, and the Latins that of Transubstantiation. But we must  
not

not pass over in silence what Mr. *Arnaud* confesses, that the Doctrin of the Latins is so offensive that 'tis strange it has found any followers, had it not been authorised by an universal consent. This acknowledgment must at least shew the world how important it is to prevent being abused by this pretended universal consent, and engaging in a sentiment which moreover is so offensive. But as the discussion of this question touching the universal consent has no proportion with the capacity of most people, this very thing should shew, that to ground ones Faith on a solid foundation, wherein there's no deceit to be feared, the best which one can do, is to keep to the Word of God.

THE third difference which Mr. *Arnaud* remarks consists in that the changes which I alledg are changes of Practice and Discipline, whereas that in question is a change of Opinion and Doctrin. Now, says he, *Discipline is a thing of it self liable to change, and the benefit of it depends on circumstances which are mutable; but Doctrins are immutable in their own nature: that which is true at one time being so always. Every body knows that Discipline may be alter'd, and every one knows that Doctrins cannot change. So, adds he, to introduce a new Discipline, 'tis not necessary to deceive the world, nor shew 'tis ancient, but to introduce a new Doctrin the novelty must of necessity be disguised, which is oftentimes impossible. In fine, the belief of a Doctrin necessarily imports the condemnation of the contrary opinion, whereas one may embrace a Discipline different from another, yet without condemning that which one leaves.*

THERE are several things to be said to this discourse. For first, It is not true that all the points of Practice and Discipline are mutable. The practices which our Saviour Christ himself has instituted in his Church with an expresse command of observing 'em are perpetual, immutable, and necessary, at least as to necessity of precept, and such is the Communion of both kinds. Secondly, There are few persons amongst the people that are prepossessed with this opinion that the points of practice and Discipline may be changed, the greatest part go not so far as this distinction of points of Practice, and Doctrins. The abolishment of a practice rather appears to them a change of Religion than an abolition or introduction of a Doctrin, because of two parts whereof a Religion consists, to wit, the Doctrins, and Practices, these last are most popular. Thirdly, There are practices which are so strictly joyn'd with Doctrins, and are in such a manner the dependances and consequences of 'em, that 'tis impossible to change them, without also changing the Doctrins, and consequently without condemning all contrary Doctrins. Such is the practice of communicating under both kinds; for it was anciently grounded on this belief, that Christ's command belongs as well to Ministers as the People; as appears by *Paschasus* his own testimony, *Drink ye all of it, says he, to wit, as well the Ministers as other Believers*: and this was joyn'd with the condemnation of the contrary practice. *It is not well done, says the same Paschasus, to Communicate of the Flesh without the Blood: This Mystery, says Pope Gelasius, cannot be divided without committing a great Sacrilege. It is a mere abusing the world, says Mr. Arnaud, to pretend to establish an universal Doctrin which is received in the whole Church on a single passage of a Popes Writings, recited by Gratien, and to oppose this single passage against the constant practice of all the Churches in the world, who have given the Communion to the faithful under one Species in sundry occasions.* But of whom would Mr. *Arnaud* have us to learn bet-

*Lib. de Corp. & Sang. Domin. c. 15. & c. 19. Gela. apud Gra. Canon. Compertimus de cons. dist. 2. Lib. c. cap. 10. p. 589.*



ter the belief of the Church in the time of *Gelasius*, than of *Gelasius* himself, who was at the head of the Church of *Rome*, who calls her self the faithful depository of Tradition? Is Mr. *Arnaud* so scandaliz'd at the producing of a Testimony of a Pope? *It is Gratien*, says he, *that relates it*. Is it the less authentick for that? *Gratien* did not invent it to serve us, we did not inspire him with it; and the Correctors of *Gratien* have not so much as doubted of it. *This passage*, adds he, *may receive several rational explications*. I know he endeavours to elude every thing by explications, but we should know whether these explications be just: Mr. *Arnaud* should propose 'em, and then we might examin 'em. This constant practice of all the Churches that have given the Communion to the faithful under one kind in several occasions is likewise a thing that ought to be proved. Mr. *Arnaud* knows he need not long stay for an answer, to what's alledg'd touching that subject.

*Aug. de Peccat  
nar. & remiss.  
lib. 1. c. 24.*

Page 590.

*Maldon. in  
Joan. 6.  
Binn. not. in  
Epist. Innoc.*

THE Communion of little Children is likewise another practice appendant to a Doctrin, for the ancient Church had this custom, because she believ'd this Communion absolutely necessary for the salvation of Infants. *S. Austin* says so in exprefs terms. *Ecclesie Christi tenent præter baptismum & participationem Dominicæ mensæ non solum non ad regnum Dei, sed nec ad salutem & vitam æternam posse quemquam hominum pervenire*. Mr. *Arnaud* is angry with me for making this belief an universal Doctrin of the Church, *To the end*, says he, *its authority may be (with plausible pretences) trampled under foot, and a Doctrin of Tradition rejected*. But what have I done in this matter more than the Jesuite *Maldonat* (who was as much a Catholick as Mr. *Arnaud*) did before me? *Missam facio*, says he, *Augustini & Innocentii primi sententiam quæ sexcentos circiter annos vixit in Ecclesia, Eucharistiam etiam, infantibus necessariam*. What have I done more than *Binius* in his Notes on *Innocent's* Letter to the Fathers of the Council of *Milevé*. It appears, says he, *that Innocent's opinion which has been in vogue for six hundred years, and which was followed by S. Austin was, that the Eucharist is necessary to little Children*. But seeing the command to receive the Eucharist does not oblige those that cannot receive it, and that we must reckon them unfit to receive the Eucharist that cannot receive it with the respect due to it, the Church, instructed by the use of several Ages, and the Decree of the Council of *Trent* has well determin'd, not only that the reception of the Eucharist is not necessary to Children, but that it ought not to be given 'em.

Page 590.

*I know*, adds Mr. *Arnaud*, *that there are on this subject some passages of S. Austin and Innocent the First, which are difficult*. But Mr. *Claude* knows very well that *Fulgentius* and *Bede* have explained these passages. He knows also that *Cardinal Perron* and several other Catholick Authors have solved them. To the passages of *S. Austin*, and *Innocent*, Mr. *Arnaud* might add others, which will admit of no explication, as those of *Gelasius* the First in one of his Epistles, of the Author of the *Hypogonicks*, of *Gregory* the Second, of the second Council of *Toul*, and some others. And as to the soft'ning Expositions of *Fulgentius*, they hinder not but that the opinion of the ancient Church was in effect what we now presented, as also the Answers of *Cardinal Perron*, which are for the most part but mere illusions.

WE may reckon amongst the practices depending on a Doctrin that of the relative adoration of Images which has insinuated it self into *France*, and *Germany* since the 8th. and 9th. Century. For it is certain that in all the

the foregoing Ages and long after, *France* and *Germany* rejected this Adoration as unlawful and contrary to true Piety. Which appears by the Council of *Francfort* held under *Charlemain*, and consisting of above three hundred Bishops, of *France*, *Italy*, *Germany*, and *England*, wherein the second Council of *Nice* was condemned. This moreover appears by the Book of Images of *Charlemain*, by the Testimonies of *Agobard* Bishop of *Lyons*, *Jonas* Bishop of *Orleans*, and *Walafridus Strabo*, by the Council of *Paris*, under *Lewis* the *Debonnair*, and by the Continuer of *Climoimus*. We find likewise in *Nicetas Choniatus* that the Germans in the 12th. Century persisted in this opinion. *The Germans*, says he, *and the Armenians agree in this, that they reject the worshiping of Images.* Mr. *Arnaud*, who cannot deny so plain a matter of fact, says, that the Bishops of *Francfort* admitted the adoration of the Cross, which is only an image of the true Cross, that they admitted likewise the historical use of images; and that without doing violence to nature, the historical use of Images cannot be separated from the relative adorations of the same images. But this is an impertinent disputing against the Fathers of *Francfort*, and the Churches that have follow'd them. The question is not whether they were contrary to themselves, or whether they did violence to nature. But whether it be true that the contrary belief and practice have insensibly crept into these very Churches, without noise, opposition, and disputations. Now this is what cannot be denied.

*Nicet. Choni.*  
L. 2.  
Page 986.

*IT* is not at all strange, says Mr. *Arnaud*, that the particular opinion of these Bishops which is contrary to nature, reason, and the general consent of the whole Church should be laid aside, and that the Popes who used this condescension towards 'em did not openly oppose 'em, but tarried till time wore out this Error, whereby they have had the success which they expected from so charitable a conduct. So far is it from being strange that this should happen, that 'twould be a greater wonder if this has not hapned. This methinks is a disposing too freely of the judgments and consent of rational people. It will not then be strange according to Mr. *Arnaud* that the Popes, and all this party that were in the opinion and practice of the relative adoration of Images should use any condescension towards three hundred Bishops assembled in Council, the Kingdom of *France*, and all *Germany* which were in a contrary Belief and practice, that they should be cautious of opposing them in this particular, and patiently expect till time remedied this mistake. But according to the same Mr. *Arnaud*, this will be the greatest of all follies, and the highest extravagancy imaginable to suppose that some *Paschafists*, and *Bertramists*, which is to say, those that believed the Real Presence, and those that believed it not in the 10th. Century, did not dispute one against another: and altho that moreover they were not in a condition to dispute, and had other things to trouble themselves about, other interests to mind, yet must it be a folly to imagin they were of that patient and charitable disposition the Popes were of, who referred these things to be remedied by time. Mr. *Arnaud* forbids us to be astonish'd at *France* and *Germanies* insensibly changing a Doctrine and a Rite; he forbids us to concern our selves about the questions of the birth and progress of this change, the stupidity of the Bishops on both sides; who look'd upon one another as Excommunicated persons, yet without daring to speak to one another about it, being withheld by a holy condescension, and the hope of the good effects of time, and by the marvellous meekness of the Laicks, some of whom were worshipers of Images and others not, and some of 'em consequently Anathematiz'd by the Council of *Nice*, and others condemned by that of *Francfort*,

and yet lived in peace, without noise, without mutual oppositions, without disputes. But if we will hear him on the other change touching the Eucharist, he commands us not only to be astonish'd; but to esteem it a fearful prodigy that the Doctrin of the Real Presence which sprang up in the 9th. Century, was taught and maintain'd as being the ancient and perpetual Doctrin of the Fathers, should make insensible progresses during the darkness of the 10th. Century, and that there should have been persons in the same Church that have believed it, and others that have not, without falling foul upon, and opposing one another. When the question of the adoration of Images was agitated in the East, it vehemently heated mens minds, so that each party proceeded to Anathema's, Banishments, and Blood-shed: and in the West, the contrary party to the Adoration wrote, and held Assemblies, whereas when the question of the Real Presence was handled, in the 9th. Century there were neither Councils called, nor Anathema's pronounced, nor Banishments, nor any extraordinary matter. Yet in respect of the former, Mr. *Arnaud* will that by virtue of condescension and th' effects of time, the Party for the Adoration has insensibly fortify'd themselves, and at length got the upper hand; but as to the other he will not grant that the Real Presence could advance and communicate it self to several persons, but the whole Universe must be shaken with it. Let the Reader then Judge of Mr. *Arnaud's* equity.

Page 287.

*NOTHING*, says he, *is more astonishing than this universal forgetfulness in the 11th. Century, whether there was therein any other Doctrin amongst Christians than that of the Real Presence.* But who told him that they of the 11th. Century forgot the contest which had been in the 9th. Was not *John Scot's* Book burnt by a Council? Let him forget it if he will, there will redound no advantage to him by it, seeing 'tis certain that in the 9th. Century the Doctrin contrary to the Real Presence was taught; I mean, that which asserts the Eucharist not to be the Body of Jesus Christ, Christ born of the Virgin, and that 'tis only the Body of Jesus Christ Sacramentally and virtually. Moreover, Mr. *Arnaud* does not observe that this very thing is against him; for if it be true that those of the 11th. Century forgot such a matter of fact as that which is justify'd by the testimony of *Paschasius* himself, this is a sufficient mark that the 10th. Century which holds the middle between the 9th. and 11th. was overspread with thick darkness, seeing the ideas, and memory of a thing so considerable were therein lost.

Page 960.

*BUT* we must examin his fourth difference. *A fourth circumstance,* says he, *which does further strangely distinguish this pretended change in the Doctrin of the Eucharist, from all these other changes, is the very nature of this Doctrin.* (He means of the Real Presence and Transubstantiation.) *For it is clear, that had it been new it must have extraordinarily surpriz'd all those that never heard of it, which is to say the whole Church.* I confess that in effect the Doctrin of the Conversion of Substances in the Eucharist has something in it that is very surprizing and more offensive than whatsoever is done in other changes. But Mr. *Arnaud* knows very well that this quality of offensive and surprizing in a Doctrin, is not strong enough to produce actually of it self an opposition or a rejection; on the contrary, most people love in matters of Religion those things that are surprizing and wonderful, of which we see examples in most Religions. But howsoever the Teachers of the Real Presence provided against this inconveniency



venience three ways, the first was the making 'em a Buckler of the Almighty power of God. The second, the publishing of Miracles which really hapned about the Eucharist, to wit, visible apparitions of Flesh and Blood. And the third, the asserting 'twas always the Faith and belief of the Church, accommodating to their sense some passages of the Fathers ill taken and ill explained.

HITHERTO we have had whatsoever Mr. *Arnaud* has said that is considerable on the question of the possibility or impossibility of the change in his 6th. and 9th. Book. Whatsoever is therein of moment we have considered and answer'd solidly and pertinently as Mr. *Arnaud* himself, I hope, will acknowledg. I should have been very glad if he would have told us his opinion on a passage, taken out of a Book, called, *The new Hereſie publickly maintain'd at Paris in the College of Clermont.* The Author of this Book therein discovers the order and means which he pretends his adversaries use to introduce Novelties insensibly into the Church, and he instances for this purpose the Parable of the Tares that were sown in the night, whilst men slept, which took root, and in time grew up, which is very near the manner after which, according to us, the change was wrought touching the Eucharist. This Author has well comprehended it, as judging it far from being impossible; but Mr. *Arnaud* thought meet to say nothing to this passage.

I should likewise been very glad; that having treated as he has done with great earnestness of the Doctrine of the Greek and other Eastern Churches, he had made reflection on several Doctrines and Practices which separate them from the Latins, and in which there have hapned of necessity, either amongst the one or the others, insensible changes. For example, how came it to pass the Greeks lost the belief of Purgatory, supposing this were a Doctrine of the first establishment of Christian Religion. How came they to believe the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father alone, and also that unleaven'd Bread in the administration of the Eucharist is an abomination, and likewise that the Priests may as well as the Bishops administer Confirmation; and again, that the Church of *Rome* is not infallible in matters of Faith, and that the Saints enjoy not the beatifical vision of God till the Resurrection: and in short, how came they to believe all the rest of those opinions which they hold contrary to those of the Latins? There must of necessity have been a time wherein the Greeks and Latins were agreed in all these Articles, whether we conceive that then neither of 'em held them, which is to say, that these Articles be not of Apostolical Tradition, whether we suppose they held them in common since the first Preaching of Christianity, which supposes that these Opinions were left 'em by the Apostles, or whether we imagin that the Greeks as well as the Latins have ever held what they now hold at this day, but that they supported mutually one another, which supposes that both of 'em held these Opinions as needless ones, and regarded the contrary opinions as tolerable ones. Now in whatsoever sort we take it, there have of necessity hapned insensible changes without dispute, noise, and opposition, altho there may be the same objections brought against 'em, and the same questions started which the Author of the *Perpetuity* and Mr. *Arnaud* have urged against the change in question.

Should

SHOULD we suppose a time wherein neither the one nor the other held these Opinions, how come they in fine to be imbued so generally with 'em, and so contradictorily, that a whole Church should hold the contrary of what the other believes? Is there not in this double change at least as much reason to be astonish'd and surpriz'd, as in that which has hapned according to us, in respect of the Real Presence? Have both the Latins and Greeks fallen asleep without knowing any thing of the fire of Purgatory, or Procession of the Holy Spirit, or quality which the Eucharistical Bread ought to be of, or th' administration of Confirmation, or Beatifical Vision of the Saints, nor th' Infallibility of the Church of *Rome*; and have they all together at the same time awaken'd possess'd with contrary opinions on each of these points? Whence had they their opinions? Did not he who first taught them 'em advertise 'em that he Preached Novelties to 'em which they never heard of? If he did tell 'em of this, 'tis strange he should be followed immediately by his whole Church, and that such new Doctrins should be so immediately and zealously embraced. If he did not tell 'em this, 'tis then very strange nobody took notice of these Innovations, that the Bishops and Priests did not oppose 'em, and that of all that innumerable multitude of Religious persons not one of 'em has exclaimed against the Innovator. Had the Innovator made use of some expressions of Scripture and of the Church to conceal the novelty of these Doctrins, and to make people believe that that was the ancient Faith, how can one conceive these terrible equivocations, that expressions have been taken in one sense during a certain time generally by the whole Latin Church, or generally by the whole Greek Church, and that immediately in another, they have been taken generally by the same Churches in another sense?

IF we suppose a time wherein both Greeks and Latins believed the same thing in respect of these points, the same difficulties and the same questions return in respect of that of the two Churches which has changed. Suppose for example that the Greeks and Latins both believed the Church of *Rome* is infallible, that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son, that one may use indifferently in the Eucharist unleavened Bread, and that which is leaven'd, and that the Bishop alone has the right of Confirmation, how happens it the Greeks have pass'd into contrary Opinions without divisions amongst 'em till the Council of *Florence*? Has this hapned all at a stroke? Was this done insensibly and by succession of time? If this has hapned all at once, it must be granted this change is exceeding strange, that so many Bishops, Priests, and Religious should so suddenly renounce their former Opinions, and embrace contrary ones without any Divisions amongst 'em. But 'tis yet strange, they should change 'em without perceiving it, without acknowledging they had made great and considerable Innovations in their Church, and comparing their first and ancient Faith with this new one. For 'tis certain that in respect of all these Articles which are in contest, the Greeks positively maintain and have ever maintain'd they have not innovated in any thing. If this change was wrought by succession of time, let us be shew'd the Disputes and Divisions they have had amongst 'em since on these Articles they have separated from the Church of *Rome*, till the Greek Empire fell into the hands of the Latins, which is to say during above two hundred and fifty years. If it be alledg'd the change was made insensibly, we must return to the four times of the Author of the *Perpetuity*, and apply to 'em the same difficulties and objections he has rais'd.

IN fine, if we suppose a time wherein the two Churches held each of 'em their Opinions, yet mutually bearing with one another without proceeding to an express condemnation of the contrary Opinions, besides that it is difficult to comprehend how the Latins believing the Roman Church infallible, and their Sacrifice with unleaven'd Bread good and lawful, could suffer the Greeks holding on the contrary that the Roman Church may err in matters of Faith. Besides this, I say, 'twill be demanded how they could change so suddenly their Opinion in reference to the controverted Articles, holding 'em before for unnecessary points, and afterwards for necessary ones, respecting before the contrary Opinions to theirs as tolerable Errors, and afterwards respecting 'em as abominable and intolerable ones: whereupon one may make the same questions, how it could come to pass that the whole Greek Church has believ'd at one time that the Eucharist of the Latins with unleaven'd Bread was nevertheless the true Body of Jesus Christ, an object of supreme Adoration, and in another that 'twas only a dead Azym, a Jewish abomination; that she should respect it at one time with that Reverence and Devotion due only to the Son of God, and at another immediately succeeding the first, which is to say from night to morning, regard it with horror, washing and purifying the Altars whereon it had been celebrated as if they had been polluted.

WE may apply the same questions and difficulties to the Armenians; Jacobites, Coptics, Nestorians, in reference to several of their Opinions of which Mr. *Arnaud* cannot shew the original, nor tell us after what manner they were dispersed amongst these people, nor how they have left the contrary opinions which the Church of *Rome* still holds as being of Apostolical Tradition. How has it hapned for instance that the Nestorians have left the use of Confirmation, and that of Extreme Unction, that the Jacobites have left that of Confession, and the belief of Purgatory, that the Coptics have laid aside the Doctrin of Purgatory, and use of Extreme Unction, and so of the rest. For Mr. *Arnaud*, I think, would have me suppose, that according to him these points have been heretofore held and practis'd by all Christians.

THESE examples do clearly discover the vanity of these pretended moral impossibilities which the Author of the *Perpetuity*, and Mr. *Arnaud* have urged with such great exaggeration. For they may be all as strongly applied to the changes which have hapned in these Eastern Churches, and yet it must be granted that these changes hapned there. Mr. *Arnaud* may argue as long as he pleases, start questions, and raise difficulties, these insensible changes are more than possible, for they are come to pass either in these Churches, or in the Latin, which has Opinions, and contrary Customs, which shews that these Gentlemens whole Philosophy is but a mere Speculation, proper only for persons that abound with leisure, which does not at all agree with the manner after which things are carried on in the world.

BUT in short the use which is made of the Seminaries, and Missions, and the course which the Emissaries take in the East, as we have observ'd in the second Book, with the project of *Thomas à Jesu* to make in a short time, all the Greeks, good Roman Catholicks, according as I have related in the fourth Book; all this I say shews clearly that at *Rome*, and elsewhere amongst the most zealous, it is not at all accounted impossible to introduce insensibly



insensibly, and without disturbance the Doctrins of the Romish Church amongst people that have 'em not, and in effect it must be granted that their present labors are not unsuccessful, and that time will probably finish the work.

## C H A P. VIII.

*That Paschasius Ratbert was the first that taught the Real Presence and Conversion of Substances. Mr. Arnaud's Objections Answered.*

**W**E must come now to particular matters of fact which relate to the History of the Change. Not but to speak truly this discussion appears to me very needless, considering what we have already done. For if the principal question which respects the novelty of Transubstantiation and the Real Presence be ended, and moreover there results from our Dispute that the change was possible, and that there's nothing more vain than the objections which the Author of the *Perpetuity* and Mr. *Arnaud* have made on this subject, I see not any necessity there is of informing a man's self in what manner this change hapned. What matter is it to us who was the first Author of this Innovation, who the promoters of it, what facilities or difficulties were met with in the establishing of these Doctrins, whether *Paschasius* carried on his business with craft, or simplicity; whether *John Scot*, *Bertram*, and *Raban* wrote against him before or after his death? What signifies the knowing of these things provided we are certain not only that the change in question was possible, but actually hapned? And this does now appear so plainly as will satisfy every rational man. In examining Mr. *Arnaud's* 6th. and 9th. Book we have made it appear that his pretended impossibilities are mere chimera's. And as to the actual change, besides that we shall always have right to take it for granted by our proofs of fact, which is to say by the passages of the Fathers, which we have cited, till Mr. *Arnaud* and his friends have taken pains to answer 'em solidly: besides this, I say, what I shewed concerning the Eastern Churches not holding the Doctrins in question, neither in the 11th. nor following Centuries, and the Greeks and Latins not knowing 'em in the 7th. and 8th. Century, is more than sufficient for the concluding that these Doctrins are not of the first establishment of Christian Religion, and consequently that their introduction is an innovation. Yet will I not desist from examining the points of History which respect this change, because this change is indeed the first and principal subject of the Dispute between Mr. *Arnaud* and us.

*Paschasius Ratbert*, a Religious of *Corbie* that lived in the 9th. Century was (according to us) the first who taught the conversion of the substances of the Bread and Wine, and the Real Presence of the Body of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist. He treats of these Points in three different places of his works, in his Book *of the Body and Blood of our Lord*, in his Commentaries on the 26th. Chapter of *S. Matthew*, and in his Letter to *Frudegard*. Mr. *Arnaud* calls our pretension on this subject *a new Hypothesis and a*  
pure

pure work of fancy. But, adds he, as *mens fancies* are very different, that of other Ministers who wrote before Aubertin turn'd not on this hinge, as not thinking 'twere their interest to set 'emselves more against Paschasus than other Authors of that Century. So that this same Paschasus against whom they pronounce such woes, was at first, in another course of fancy, one of their best friends. Henry Boxornius a furious and passionate Calvinist asserts; that he perfectly well explain'd the Doctrin of the Eucharist, and makes him a Calvinist by the common privilege of all the Ministers, to make Calvinists of whom they please. Hospinien likewise treats him very kindly, and takes him for one of the witnesses of the true Doctrin of the Church during the 9th. Century. Blondel seems not to have any particular quarrel against him, but only charges him for following the innovations which he attributes to Anastasius Sinait and the Greeks, which he pretends were embraced by Charlemain, and the Council of Francfort, but does not think of making him an Author of any considerable change in the world.

IT must be acknowledg'd there is a great deal of rancor and injustice in this discourse. First, seeing Mr. Arnaud himself affirms that Paschasus taught the Real Presence and Transubstantiation, why does he make it criminal in Mr. Aubertin and me to do the same? Does the aversion which he has to our persons transport him so far, that he cannot endure we should be agreed with him, no not in one point? I acknowledg that as oft as Mr. Aubertin and I affirm Paschasus taught the Real Presence and Transubstantiation, we do at the same time add that he was an Innovator, wherein we are at odds with Mr. Arnaud. But why may we not at least agree with him in one Point, if we cannot in more? Let him oppose us as oft as he will touching th' innovation of Paschasus, we shall not dislike it, for he maintains his own sentiment; but let him give us leave to tell him that Paschasus also taught the Real Presence and Transubstantiation, seeing that herein we say nothing but what he himself asserts, and all Roman Catholicks with him.

SECONDLY, 'tis not generally true that those who wrote before Mr. Aubertin did not acknowledg that the Doctrin of Paschasus was the Real Presence and Transubstantiation. The Author of the Orthodox Treatise touching the Eucharist, Printed at Lyons in the year 1595. expressly mentions that Paschasus laid the foundations of Transubstantiation, and Consubstantiation. Mr. Le Faucheur says he taught that the Eucharist was the proper Body and the proper Blood of Jesus Christ residing substantially in the Bread and Wine. Du Plessis ranks him amongst those that have proposed a contrary Doctrin to that of the Fathers and the Church. And long before them Berenger himself attributed to Paschasus the Doctrin of the conversion of the substances as well as we. *Sententia*, said he, according to Lanfranc, imo *vecordia vulgi*, Paschasi, atque Lanfranci minime *superesse in altari post consecrationem substantiam panis & vini*.

Page 479.

Lib. 9. Ch. 6.

Book 4. of the Sacrament pretended in the Mass. ch. 9. Lanfranc de Corp. &amp; Sang. Dom.

BUT 'tis needless to cite Authorities, when the point concerns a matter which may be clear'd by reading Paschasus himself. He that takes pains to read exactly his Book *De Corpore & sanguine Domini*, his Commentaries on the 26. of S. Matthew, and his Letter to Frudegard, will find, First, That he held and taught the substance of the Bread and Wine was changed absolutely into the same Flesh which is born of the Virgin, which died, and rose again, altho the colour, and savor of Bread and Wine still remains. Secondly,

C c c c

That

That he held and taught that the Flesh of Jesus Christ enters into our flesh, and that as he has joyn'd our substance to his Divinity, so he will have *his substance* to be in our flesh. Thirdly, That he held and taught, that the words of Jesus Christ, *This is my Body*, must be understood neither of the figure of his Body, nor his Body in the Sacrament, nor of his Body in virtue, but of his Body born of the Virgin, Crucified and Risen, *in propriety of nature*. Fourthly, That he disputed as strongly as he could against those that held the contrary. Fifthly, That there were made against his Doctrin such objections as naturally arise from the Real Presence, such as the Roman Church does at this day believe it to be. Sixthly, That he endeavoured to answer these objections on the Hypothesis of the Roman Church.

IT hence, methinks very clearly results that *Paschasius* held and taught the same Real Presence, and the same substantial conversion, as *Gregory VII.* and *Innocent III.* establish'd since in the Latin Church, and that this truth cannot be call'd in question. Yet must what I observed in my answer to the *Perpetuity* be remembred, that the Book *De Corpore & Sanguine Domini* does not every where contain the Doctrin of the conversion of substances in a manner so exprels, or uniform, but that there are here and there several passages which seem at first to favour the subsistence of the Bread, and several others that are capable of a Sacramental sence, or may be turn'd to the union of the Bread with the Divinity, according to *Damasceus's* Doctrin. Mr. *Arnaud* must grant me this, seeing he sometimes alledges *Paschasius* his expressions, & elude such kind of ones which are to be met with in the Fathers. Now hence it has hapned that several Protestants having been deceiv'd by these passages, have reckon'd this Author amongst the number of those that held not Transubstantiation. But their error having sprang from the want of attentive examining the depths of his Doctrin, Mr. *Arnaud* does not do right in drawing hence advantage against those that have entered into a more exact scrutiny of him, especially considering that this opinion justifies it self by the bare reading of *Paschasius* his Writings, and that this is moreover Mr. *Arnaud's* own sentiment, and that also of his whole Church.

WE need only now see whether *Paschasius* in teaching the Real Presence and Transubstantiation has been an Innovator, that is to say, whether he first taught a Doctrin which no body ever before him did teach. Mr. *Arnaud* affirms, that according to my proper Principles this would be impossibly human. His reason is that I said in some places of my answer, *That the expressions of the Fathers were not of themselves capable to give rise to this opinion, and therefore the idea of it must come from elsewhere. That supposing these expressions and a thousand such like were every day uttered by the Fathers, they could never form in the peoples minds the idea of a Transubstantiation, or a Real Presence, such as the Roman Church teaches, unless they were prepossessed with it by some other means. That there's no likelihood that before Paschasius made this first explication, men abandoned their senses and reason to conceive the Real Presence, and that certainly no place but the solitary and idle Convent of Corbie could bring forth such an extravagant fancy.* Let a man upon this judg, says Mr. *Arnaud*, what kind of blade this *Paschasius* must be according to Mr. *Claude*, seeing that on one hand he was able to invent an opinion which could never come into any bodies head but his own; and further had the power and good luck to persuade the whole world into the belief of it with circumstances which are yet more admirable. Certainly this is beyond the reach of man.



I ANSWER, that Mr. *Arnaud* draws his consequences always ill. We said that the people who usually follow the lights of nature and common sense, and whose meditations are not strong enough of themselves to invent this pretended manner of making the Body of Jesus Christ to exist in Heaven and on Earth both at a time, could not raise the idea of this from the expressions of the Fathers, and Mr. *Arnaud* hence concludes 'tis impossible that *Paschasus* has invented this opinion, or been able to persuade others to embrace it. This consequence is absurd, for we have examples of such kind of persons as *Paschasus* who have wandred from the true lights of nature, and fallen into remote imaginations, which no body ever had before 'em, and which the people were (certainly) never capable of. I confess that in some respect one may marvel at these figuaries of human invention, because they are irregularities, it being likewise astonishing to see men capable of so many disorders; but it must not be hence concluded that these disorders are more than human, or that 'tis impossible for a people who did did not invent an opinion themselves, to follow it when 'tis well contrived and coloured. We see this happens every day, and Mr. *Arnaud* should propose something more solid.

THE true way to know whether *Paschasus* was an Innovator or not, is to enquire whether those that went before him taught the same Doctrine, for if they did, we are to blame in charging him with an innovation; but if on the contrary we find their Doctrine different from his, we cannot doubt but he innovated. And this is the course Mr. *Aubertin* has taken; for he offers not the history of the change, of which he makes *Paschasus* the first Author, till he shew'd by an exact discussion of each particular Century, that till *Paschasus* his time no body ever spake like him; whence it follows of necessity, that he was an Innovator. It belong'd therefore to Mr. *Arnaud* and the Author of the *Perpetuity* (had they design'd to deal sincerely) to take this course, and shew that *Paschasus* said nothing but what others said before him. This would have been an easie and direct method, supposing *Paschasus* had not been an Innovator, but Mr. *Arnaud* does not like the engaging in these kind of discussions.

HE thought it more for his purpose to fall upon a fruitless criticism by which he pretends to conclude, *That no body publickly declared himself against Paschasus his Book all the time he lived, That no body wrote against him, That no Bishop, no Abbot of his Order reproached him with it, That there were only some persons who shew'd in secret they were frighted at these truths, and said not in writing, but in particular discourses, that he had gone too far, and yet this was not till three years after he had publish'd his Book.* Book 8. ch. 8. p. 241.

SUPPOSING this remark to be as certain, as Mr. *Arnaud* has made it, what advantage will he pretend hence? Will *Paschasus* be ever the less an Innovator for his not finding any thing publish'd against him during his life? All that can be concluded hence is, that his Book was but little known at first, and afterwards but of small esteem with great men; and that if they believed themselves oblig'd at length to write against his Doctrine, 'twas only because they saw several follow'd it, whom 'twas necessary to undeceive. For to imagin that *John Scot*, *Bertram*, and *Raban* shunn'd the opposing him during his life, that they might not bring upon 'em so terrible an Adversary, must proceed from th' ignorance of what these three great men were, who

had another kind of esteem amongst the learned than *Paschasus*. 'Tis also a ridiculous conjecture to imagin they lay quiet during his life, because his Doctrin was then the common Doctrin of the Church, which they dared not oppose. For if this reason hindred 'em from writing against *Paschasus* during his life, why did it not do the same after his death, seeing the common Doctrin of the Church was still the same; and *Paschasus* carried it not away with him into his Grave?

BUT at bottom there's nothing more uncertain than this remark of Mr. Arnaud. For as to *John Scot*, there's not the least reason to guess he wrote since *Paschasus* his death. We know he wrote of the Eucharist by the command of *Charles the Bald*, and consequently whilst he was in *France*, whether this was before or after the year 852, 'twill be in my opinion hard to determin. As to *Raban* we cannot be certain whether this *Egilon* to whom he wrote his Letter against *Paschasus*; was either *Egilon* Abbot of *Fulda*, who died in the year 822, or another *Egilon* Abbot of *Prom*, who succeeded *Marquard* in the year 853. For as to what is said by the anonymous Treatise which Father *Celot* publish'd; which is; that *Raban* was Archbishop of *Mayence* when he wrote this Letter, is very weak. It's true it terms him *Raban* of *Mayence*, but upon another occasion, to wit, when the Author accuses him to have taught, that the mystery of the Body and Blood of our Lord is expos'd to the common condition of aliments; whereas when he mentions the Letter which he wrote against *Paschasus*, he calls him only *Raban*, and hence can be nothing certain gather'd. As to *Bertram*, Mr. Arnaud alledges no other reason but this, *That there's little likelihood he would write against his Abbot whilst he was under his Jurisdiction, and that Paschasus who believed his Doctrin could not be attack'd without a crime, must have complain'd of this attempt.* But is Mr. Arnaud ignorant of what the President *Maugin* has written touching *Bertram*, that he was not only a very learned but a very honest man; a bold defender of the Catholick Faith against all Innovators, and that he wrote against *Hincmar* his own Bishop, altho he was upheld by the Kings Authority. What likelihood is there that a man who scrupled not to write against his Metropolitan and such a man as *Hincmar*, who was countenanced by the King, would stick to write by the Kings order too against *Paschasus* altho he was his Abbot.

Book 8. ch. 8.  
p. 842.

Dissert. c. 17.

IT signifies nothing for Mr. Arnaud to say, *That Paschasus clearly testifies that his Doctrin was only attack'd by private Discourses and not by Books.* For this cannot be collected from his expressions, unless we read 'em with glosses and interpretations of Mr. Arnaud. Let those, says *Paschasus* in his Commentary on the 26th. of *S. Matthew*, that will extenuate the term of *Body*, hear me; those that say, that 'tis not the true *Flesh* of *Jesus Christ* which is now celebrated in the Sacrament in the Church; and that 'tis not his true *Blood*, imagining they know not what, that 'tis in this Sacrament the virtue of the *Flesh* and *Blood*, and make the Lord a lyar saying, that 'tis not his true *Flesh*, nor his true *Blood*, by which we declare his true death; whereas truth it self says, *This is my Body*. And a little lower, I am astonish'd at some peoples saying 'tis not the real *Flesh* and *Blood* of *Jesus Christ* in the same thing, but that it is Sacramentally so, a certain virtue of his *Flesh*, and not his *Flesh*, the virtue of his *Blood*, and not his *Blood*, the figure and not the truth, the shadow, and not the *Body*. And in another place a little further, I spake of these things the more largely and more expressly, because I understand that some re-  
prehend

reprehend me as if I would (in the Book which I wrote concerning the Sacraments of Christ) attribute to these words more than the truth it self promises. And in his Letter to Frudegard, *Sed quidam*, says he, *loquacissimi magis quam docti dum hæc credere refugiant, quæcunque possunt, ne credant quæ veritas repromittit, opponunt, & dicunt nullum corpus esse quod non sit palpabile, & visibile, hæc autem inquit, quia mysteria sunt videri nequeunt, nec palpari, & ideo corpus non sunt, & si corpus non sunt, in figura carnis & sanguinis hæc dicuntur, & non in proprietate naturæ carnis Christi & sanguinis, quæ caro passa est in cruce, & nata de Maria Virgine. Ecce quam bene disputant contra fidem sine fide.* It appears from these passages that Paschasius his opinion was contradicted, That he was accused for taking Christs words in a wrong sence, That he had several clear and solid objections offered him, whether by word of mouth, or writing, or by Books; or bare discourses, he does not inform us. But one may well conclude hence that this opposition consisted not in secret discourses, as Mr. Arnaud would have us believe: Are we wont to call private discourse a formal opposition by way of objection, dispute, censure, and clear and precise explication of the contrary opinion? *Opponunt*, says he, *quæcunque possunt, Ecce quam bene disputant, dicunt non in se esse veritatem carnis Christi vel sanguinis, sed in Sacramento virtutem carnis non carnem. Audivi quosdam me reprehendere, &c.* Do men thus express themselves when they would represent private discourse? But, says Mr. Arnaud, Paschasius in his Letter to Frudegard, assures; that altho some are deceived thro ignorance, yet there is no body that dared openly contradict what the whole earth believes and confesses of this mystery. I answer, that the sence of Paschasius is, that no body dared contradict openly what the whole Earth believes and confesses of this mystery, to wit, that 'tis the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, according as 'tis express'd in this clause of the Liturgy which he alledges, *Ut fiat Corpus & Sanguis dilectissimi filii tui Domini nostri Jesu Christi*; and by the words of Christ, *This is my Body*. Now what he says is true in the sence which we suppose must be given to the words of Christ, and to the terms of the Liturgy, but it does not hence follow that those that opposed the sence which Paschasius gave to these very words of the Liturgy, and to those of Christ, explain'd themselves very plainly against him, for there's a great deal of difference between acknowledging the truth of these words, and acknowledging the sence which an Author would give 'em, They confessed that the words were true, and could not be question'd without a crime; but yet this hindred 'em not from setting 'emselfes against the sence of Paschasius. Paschasius pretends to draw advantage against 'em by their acknowledging the words, imagining the words were plainly for him; but he does not at all say they dared not to dispute openly against him, nor against the sence he gave these words. This is a delusion of Mr. Arnauds, just as if any one having said that there's no body yet amongst the Protestants that has openly denied the Eucharist to be the Body of Jesus Christ, Mr. Arnaud would thence conclude that there's none of 'em then that has yet openly contradicted the sence in which the Roman Church understands it, and that they explain themselves about it only in secret discourses. But pray why must these be secret discourses during Paschasius his life, seeing Mr. Arnaud is obliged to confess there were after his death publick Writings which appeared against his Doctrin? Is not this a silly pretension which at farthest can only make us imagin Paschasius as a formidable man who held the world in awe during his life, and against whom no body dared open his mouth till after his death.

B. ok 3. ch. 8:  
P. 843.

BUT



BUT laying aside this imagination of Mr. Arnaud come we to the principal question, to wit, whether *Paschasus* was an Innovator. Mr. Arnaud to defend him from this charge has recourse to the Greek Church, which *Book 2. ch. 9.* gives, says he, *such an express testimony to his Doctrin of the Real Presence in the 7th. 8th. and 9th. Centuries, that it must needs shame those who out of a rash capricio have the boldness to affirm that Paschasus was the inventer of it.* He adds, *That all the principal Authors of the Latin Church of the same time who clearly taught it in such a manner as they ought to teach it according to the state of their time, do overthrow this ridiculous Fable.* To pass by Mr. Arnauds expressions which are always stronger than his reasons, we need only send him to th' examination of the Greek Authors of the 7th. 8th. and 9th. Centuries, and Latin Authors of the 7th. and 8th. for he will therein find wherewithal to satisfy himself above his desires. Let's only see whether he has any thing better to offer us.

HE has recourse next to his great common place of moral impossibilities, and supposing that according to us *none of the Clergy, or Laity imagin'd that Jesus Christ was really present in the Eucharist, that they all took the Eucharist for Bread and Wine in substance, that they knew the Bread and Wine were signs and Sacraments of the Body of Jesus Christ by which we obtain his Graces, and that we must meditate on the Passion of Jesus Christ in receiving them; that Paschasus very well knew that his opinion was opposite to that of the Church, and that he remain'd in her external Communion only out of a carnal motive, lest he should find himself too weak if he departed out of it; supposing I say this, he thus reasons, Let us imagin a Religious under a Regular Discipline, and him so young that he calls himself a Child, and who thinks he has discovered this marvellous secret, that Jesus Christ is really present on Earth in infinite places, that all Christians receive him really every time they partake of the Eucharist, but that by a deplorable blindness they are ignorant of this happiness, do not know the Saviour whom they have often in their hands and which they receive into their mouths, and take his real Body for an image and simple figure; that he is the only man that knows the truth of this Mystery, and is desir'd. to declare it to the world. This conceit is already very strange and contrary to the idea which a man necessarily forms on Paschasus from his Writings, there being nothing more remote from the humility and simplicity appearing in 'em than this prodigious insolency with which Mr. Claude charges him, so that we may truly say he could not worse represent the character of his mind.* He afterwards says, *that this enterprize of Paschasus of instructing all people in this new opinion was the greatest enterprize that ever any man undertook far greater than that of the Apostles when they determin'd to Preach the Gospel of Jesus Christ throughout all the world. For in fine they were twelve, they wrought Miracles, had other proofs than words, they made Disciples, and establish'd them Doctors of the truth which they preach'd. Paschasus had nothing of all this.* He triumphantly fills five great pages with this discourse.

TO answer this with somewhat less heat, we'll reply that these arguings would have been perhaps of some use had Mr. Arnaud liv'd in *Paschasus* his time; and was oblig'd to make an Oration before him in *genere deliberativo* to dissuade him from making his Book publick. But who told him at present that *Paschasus* must necessarily have all these things in his mind, and studied 'em neither more nor less than Mr. Arnaud has done in his

his Cloſet? Who told him that all thoſe who teach novelties think throlly on what they do? When *Arius* a ſimple Prieſt of *Alexandria* troubled the Church, by teaching this dreadful novelty that the Son of God was but a Creature, there's no great likelihood he propoſed to himſelf at firſt the changing of the Faith of the whole world, for inſtructing the people, and every where overthrowing what the Apoſtles had eſtabliſh'd, or compar'd his deſign with that of the Apoſtles, and examin'd what there was more or leſs in it? 'Tis the ſame in reference to *Eutychius* and other teachers of new Doctrins, their firſt thoughts were preiently to ſet forth what they imagin'd moſt conſonant to truth, leaving the ſucceſs to time, and mannaging themſelves afterwards as occaſion required. The greateſt affairs do uſually begin after this manner, men enter upon 'em without much reflection, and afterwards drive 'em on thro all that happens unforeſeen.

2. TO diſcover the vanity of Mr. *Arnaud's* arguings, we need only apply them to *John Scot*, or *Bertram*. Suppoſe we then as he would have us, that in their time the whole world believed firmly and univerſally the Real Preſence and Tranſubſtantiation, and all the Faithful had a diſtinct knowledg of it, knew all of 'em that the ſubſtance of Bread and Wine no longer ſubſiſts after their Conſecration, that what we receive in the Communion is the proper ſubſtance of the Body of Jeſus Chriſt, the ſame numerical ſubſtance which was born of the Virgin, dead and riſen, and is now ſate at the right hand of God, that the ſame Body is in Heaven and on Earth at the ſame time. *John Scot* a ſimple Religious undertakes to diſabuſe all the people, to perſuade them that what they had hitherto taken for the proper ſubſtance of the Son of God was a ſubſtance of Bread, that thro a deplorable error they had hitherto worſhip'd an object which deſerv'd not this adoration, and that henceforth by his Miniſtry and at his word all the Earth ſhould change its Faith and Worſhip. Does this deſign appear leſs ſtrange to Mr. *Arnaud* than that he imputes to *Paschaſus*, upon our ſuppoſition? All the difference I find is, that *Scot's* enterprize would be greater and harder than that of *Paschaſus*; for 'tis difficulter to root ancient and perpetual Opinions out of mens minds, than to inſpire them with new ones; to make 'em lay aſide their Rites, Altars, th'object of their ſupreme Adoration and Piety, than to make 'em receive new Services in reference to a ſubject for which they have already a great reſpect. Howſoever 'tis certain that *John Scot* wrote a Book againſt the Real Preſence, and according to Mr. *Arnaud's* Hypotheſis, this Book was an innovation contrary to the common Faith of his Age. A thouſand Arguments will never hinder but that according to him this is true. Why then will he have it to be impoſſible for *Paschaſus*, who wrote a Book touching the Real Preſence, to advance any novelty with which the Church before that time was unacquainted? Why muſt there be in Hypotheſis's which are alike facilities on the one ſide, and impoſſibilities on the other? *Paschaſus* and *John Scot* wrote, one for the Real Preſence, and the other againſt it. This is a fact which is uncontroulable. One of 'em muſt neceſſarily have offered a new Doctrine contrary to the general belief, and conſequently one of 'em muſt be an Innovator. If it be poſſible that 'twas *John Scot*, it is yet more probable 'twas *Paschaſus*; if it be impoſſible that 'twas *Paschaſus*, it is yet more impoſſible to be *John Scot*. Mr. *Arnaud* then need not ſo warm himſelf in his conſequences, ſeeing 'tis his intereſt as well as ours to acknowledg the nullity of 'em; and we may truly affirm without doing him wrong, that never man ſpent his pains to leſs purpoſe, than he has done in this occaſion.

3. ALL that can be reasonably said of *Paschasus*, is, that being yet young, and imagining the substances of Bread and Wine did not subsist in the Eucharist, but were chang'd into the substance of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, he thought this marvail was not enough known, and that 'twas necessary to explain it. And therefore he undertakes to instruct his Disciple *Placidus* in it, to whom he dedicates his Book, and the rest of his Scholars. This appears from the reading of his Preface, and second Chapter. *Placuit*, says he in his Preface, *ea quæ de Sacramento Sanguinis & corporis tibi exigis necessaria, quæ tui prætexantur amore ita tenuis perstringere, ut cæteri vitæ pabulum & salutis haustum planius tecum caperent ad medelam, & nobis operis præstantior exuberaret fructus mercedis pro sudore.* And in the second Chapter, *Tanti Sacramenti virtus investiganda est, & disciplina Christi fides erudienda, ne forte ob hoc censeamur indigni si non satis discernimus illud, nec intelligimus mysticum Christi Corpus & sanguis quanta polleat dignitate quantaque præminet virtute—ideo timendum ne per ignorantiam quod nobis provisum est ad medelam fiat accipientibus in ruinam.* There cannot be gathered any more than this touching the first design of *Paschasus*. His designs without doubt extended not so far as the whole Universe, they only respected *Placidus* and some other Scholars which he taught, and the end he propos'd was to give 'em the knowledg of this mystery which he had obtain'd, believing 'twas not sufficiently known. His Book which was design'd only for young people was yet read by many others, it excited the curiosity of several, as he himself tells us in his Letter to *Frudegard*, *Ad intelligentiam*, says he, *hujus mysterii plures ut audio commovi: I have stirred up several people to understand this mystery.* 'Tis likely several became of his mind, and 'tis certain others condemned his opinion: *Audiui*, says he, *quosdam me reprehendere*, and that others in fine remain'd in suspense and uncertainty. *Quæris*, says he, to *Frudegard*, *de re ex qua multi dubitant*, and lower, *Multi ex hoc dubitant quomodo ille integer manet, & hoc, Corpus Christi & Sanguis esse possit.* This first success so little advantageous oblig'd him to write his Commentary on the 26th. of *S. Matthew*, where he urges the words of Christ, *This is my Body*, and argues as strongly as he can against those that say 'tis the Body of Jesus Christ in a Figure, in a Sacrament, and in Virtue. In fine, *Frudegard* having offered him a passage of *S. Austin* out of his third Book, *De Doctrina Christiana*, wherein this Father says, that to eat this Flesh and drink this Blood is a figurative locution, which seems to command a sin, but which signifies to meditate on the Death and Passion of Jesus Christ for us, he thence takes occasion to write the Letter to *Frudegard*, wherein he endeavours by all means to defend his Doctrin, pressing again the words of Jesus Christ, and relating some passages of the Fathers, and Liturgy which he imagin'd were on his side. And this is all that can be said historically touching *Paschasus* his fact, in which I think there's nothing that hinders us from believing he was an Innovator, that is to say, that the Doctrin he offered was not that of the Church, as will be made plain by what we shall alledg anon. Mr. *Arnaud* should argue from these matters of fact, and not from imaginary suppositions.

Book 1. ch. 8.  
p. 248.

*PASCHASUS*, says he, proposes immediately his Doctrin without any Preface, or insinuating address, without supposing any other Principle than that God can do what he pleases. His Doctrin then was not new. This consequence is too quick. He does not mention that horrid blindness where-  
in



in be must suppose the world. Altho he does not speak of it, what can be thence concluded, those that propose novelties as the perpetual Faith of the Church are cautious of absolutely acknowledging that in this respect the world lies in an error. Yet does *Paschasus* insinuate in his Book that this mystery was unknown, that is to say, that men knew not yet his Doctrin, as I have already shew'd, and in his Letter to *Frudegard* he formally acknowledges that several were ignorant of it. *Quamvis*, says he, *plurimi ignoraverint tanti mysterii Sacramenta*. He does not trouble himself, adds Mr. Arnaud, to confirm what he says by proofs sufficient to dissipate this error. What follows hence? He proves it as well as he can, that is to say ill; yet does he advertise his *Placidus* in his Preface that he took what he offer'd out of the principal Authors of the Church, and he names *S. Cyprian, Ambrose, Hilary, Augustin, Chrysostom, Jerom, Gregory, Isidor, Isychius* and *Bede*: Now here are, I think, great names enough.

Mr. Claude, adds further Mr. Arnaud, would persuade us that a young Religious having taught in a Book a Doctrin unheard of contrary to sense and reason, and having taught it without proofs, living in a great communality, having commerce with a great number of Religious, Abbots, and Bishops, was yet advertised by none of 'em that he offered an error contrary to the Doctrin of the Church, and that not only he escap'd unpunish'd, but for thirty years together no body testifi'd any astonishment at his Doctrin; so that he only learn'd from other peoples report, and that thirty years after he wrote his Book that there were some persons who found fault with it. Mr. Arnaud's prejudice puts him upon strange things. Does he not see we need only turn his reasoning on *John Scot* and *Bertram* to expose the weakness of it? They wrote against the Real Presence: who told them they offer'd an error contrary to the Doctrin of the Church? who punish'd 'em for it? what Popes, what Councils condemn'd 'em? who, setting aside *Paschasus*, stood up against those that affirm'd the Eucharist was not the Body of Jesus Christ otherwise than Sacramentally, figuratively, and virtually, and not really, *Non in re esse veritatem carnis Christi vel Sanguinis, sed in Sacramento, virtutem quandam carnis & non carnem, virtutem Sanguinis & non Sanguinem*? Supposing no body did address themselves to *Paschasus* himself to charge him with the publishing in his Book a new Doctrin, what can be rationally inferred hence, but that his Book was at first but little known by learned men who were fit to judg of it, because a Book design'd for Scholars does not usually make any great noise, or because perhaps that it was despised, seeing that in effect there was little in it to the purpose. But, says Mr. Arnaud, at least the Monks of the Convent of Corbie must oppose him. Had they done it, they had done no more than they ought. But *Paschasus* was their Master that taught 'em, and the Disciples are not wont to contradict their Masters. *Paschasus* had immediately won to his interests *Placidus*, who was a person of Quality and a Dignitary in this Convent, as appears by the terms of *Paschasus* himself, for thus does he bespeak him. *Dilectissimo filio, & vice Christi præsidenti, Magistro Monastica Discipline, alternis successibus veritatis discipulo*. Again, who told Mr. Arnaud that no body for thirty years reprehended *Paschasus* to his face? how knows he this, that he can be so confident of it? Does *Paschasus* himself positively assure him of it? No. But 'tis because *Paschasus* says, *Audi vi quosdam me reprehendere. I am inform'd that some blame me*. Every man sees that this expression is not sufficient for the drawing of this consequence, and that an Author may speak thus, altho he was told of his fault to his face. In fine, who inform'd Mr. Ar-

naud that the contradictions which *Paschasius* met with did not happen till thirty years after the publishing of his Book? Because he complains of this in his Commentaries on *S. Matthew*, which were publish'd not till thirty years after. A frivolous reason, as if the censures which were made of his Doctrin, must needs be of the same date as his Commentaries wherein he mentions 'em, and endeavours to defend himself. It must be acknowledg'd that never man argued more unhappily than *Mr. Arnaud*.

Page 850, 851.

*N O T* only, adds he, he was not reprehended by any of his Superiors, Friends, and Brethren, but he still believed the whole Church was on his side. For in his Papers which he wrote not long before his death he presses his unknown adversaries of whom he had notice, by the Authority of the whole Church, and clearly affirms a man cannot oppose his Opinion without contradicting the Faith of it. *Videat qui contra hoc venire voluerit magis quam credere quid agat contra ipsum Dominum, & contra omnem Ecclesiam.* He says that no body dared yet openly contradict this Doctrin which he taught, nor oppose what the whole world own'd to be true. *Ideo quamvis quidam de ignorantia errent, nemo tamen adhuc est in aperto qui ita hoc esse contradicat quod totus orbis credit & confitetur.* In short he accuses those as highly criminal, who using the common Prayers of the Church explain'd them in a sense of figure and virtue, contrary to the consent of the whole Earth. *Nefandum ergo scelus est orare cum omnibus, & non credere quod ipsa veritas testatur, & ubique omnes universaliter verum esse fatentur.*

I answered the Author of the *Perpetuity*, That *Paschasius* did not say the whole world was formally of his opinion, but that this was a consequence which he would draw from the whole worlds believing to be true and above all question the words of *Jesus Christ*, *This is my Body*, which he imagin'd contain'd his Belief, and from the Churches saying in her Canon, *Ut fiat Corpus & Sanguis dilectissimi filii tui Domini nostri Jesu Christi*, to which the people answered, *Amen.* That there's a great deal of difference betwixt positive assuring that the whole Church believes by a distinct and unquestionable Faith a Doctrin, and th' introducing of it by consequences drawn from some expressions which a man believes to be favorable to this Doctrin, but which are not so greatly favorable but that they may be of use to those who believe a contrary Doctrin.

*H E R E*, says *Mr. Arnaud*, is a distinction well worthy of *Mr. Claude's* invention who admirably well pretends to answer a matter when he does nothing less, and to distinguish by terms which have no sense, that which reason cannot distinguish. Let us in good time see then whether my distinction be as extravagant as *Mr. Arnaud* would make it. When a man maintains against an opponent a Doctrin which is said to be the common Doctrin of the Church, either this proposition *that 'tis the common Doctrin of the Church*, is so clear and evident, that the Adversaries themselves must grant it, or it is not so clear nor evident but that 'tis questionable. As to the first case, a man need not trouble himself to prove it: for it's taken for a Principle, and such consequences are thence drawn as are judged fitting. For instance, When the Gentlemen of the Roman Church teach that our Saviour *Christ* died not only for the Elect, but also for all men in general; that all Gods Commands are possible to be kept by the Just, according to the present condition of their ability; that the substance of Bread is really converted into the substance of the Body of *Jesus Christ*; that the Wicked receive the Body of *Jesus Christ*, and eat it with their bodily mouths in the act of the

the Communion; it is so evident that these are the common Doctrins of this Church, that there needs no proving 'em; and should any one in the bosom of the Roman Church oppose these Articles, there's no body would take pains to prove to him that they are the Faith of the Church, for they would be supposed to be undeniable Principles, and he would have only hence consequences drawn against him: As to the second case, that is to say when 'tis not clear that this is the Faith of the Church, and that this point is in dispute, both parties apply themselves to the bringing of proofs, and each commonly endeavours to authorise his Opinion under the specious name of the Faith of the Church:

BUT as this question touching the common Doctrin of the Church may have two senses; one which regards precisely the present Church, which is to say, the Church in the time of the contest, the other which respects the Church in the preceding times, which is to say; before the controversy, it may also receive two sorts of proofs, some which refer to the present time, others which refer to the Ages which have preceded us: When a man proves for the time present, he alledges testimonies of the modern Church, when he proves for the past time; he alledges 'em of those that have lived before us, and the question determines it self according as the proofs are good, or bad, conclusive, or not conclusive.

TO apply this to the matter in hand, I say, That *Paschasius* never avanc'd for an undeniable Principle, that his Doctrin was the Doctrin or common belief of the Church in his time; on the contrary he has formally acknowledged that there were in his time three sorts of persons in the Church; the first reprehended him for mis-understanding the words of Christ. *Audui quosdam me reprehendere quasi ego in eo libro quem de Sacramentis Christi edideram aliquid his dictis plus tribuere voluerim quam ipsa veritas repromittit*, and affirm'd on the contrary that the Eucharist was the Body of Jesus Christ in figure and virtue. *Non in re esse veritatem carnis Christi vel Sanguinis, sed in Sacramento, virtutem quandam carnis & non carnem*. Others that doubted of the truth of his Doctrin, *multi dubitant*, says he, several times. And in fine, others that erred thro ignorance, which is to say, that had not yet heard of these marvels which he proposed. *Quamvis plurimi, says he, dubitaverint vel ignoraverint tanti mysterii Sacramenta*. And a little lower, *Quamvis ex hoc quidam de ignorantia errent*. He was then far from vaunting that his Doctrin was undeniably the common Faith of the Church of his Age.

I say in the second place, that whatsoever design *Paschasius* had to make people believe that he taught nothing but what was according to the Doctrin of the Church; yet did he never alledg for this effect the men of his time, nor ever said the Bishops which then governed the Churches, the Abbots, Priests, Religious, and all learned men held the same language as he did, and all of 'em unanimously confes'd, that the substance of Bread was changed into the Body of Jesus Christ born of the Virgin according to the propriety of his nature. Neither did he ever aver he held his Doctrin from Masters that taught it. *Paschasius* was far from asserting this:

HE keeps to three things, to some passages of the Fathers, to the words of Jesus Christ, *This is my Body*, to a clause of the Liturgy, which says, *Ut fiat Corpus & sanguis dilectissimi filii tui Domini nostri Jesu Christi*: And



as to the passages of the Fathers having propos'd 'em, he concludes, *That from thence one may know that what he wrote was not an effect of Enthusiastical rashness, nor a young man's vision; but that he offered these things (to those who were desirous of 'em) from the authority of the Word of God, and the Writings of the Holy Fathers.* Now seeing, adds he, it appears that all men have not Faith, yet if they cannot understand, let 'em learn to believe with the Fathers that there's nothing impossible with God, and acquiesce in the Divine words without the least doubt of 'em. For we never as yet read any have erred in this point, unless those that have erred touching the person of Jesus Christ himself, altho several have doubted, or been ignorant of the Sacraments of so great a mystery. Is this the language of a man that loudly glories in the consent of the whole Church? Were he assur'd he wrote nothing but what was according to the common belief, what need he justify himself from the suspicion of Enthusiasm and pretences to Visions? Are we wont to suspect people in this sort who say only what the whole world says and believes? And designing to justify himself, why must he rather betake himself to some passages of the Fathers, (whose sense and terms he may justly be said to have corrupted) than to the testimony of persons in his own time, and to say if he was an Enthusiast or Visionary, all the Bishops, Abbots, Priests, Religious, Doctors, and Christians in general were so too, seeing they all believ'd and spake as he did? But instead of this he complains that his Doctrin which he term'd that of the Fathers was not kindly received; *Nunc autem*, says he, *exinde quia claruit quod non omnium est fides.* He exhorts those who reprehended him, to believe with the Fathers that nothing is impossible with God, and to acquiesce in the words of Jesus Christ. *Discant quæso cum talibus credere, si adhuc nequeunt intelligere, quod Deo nihil est impossibile, discant & verbis divinis acquiescere, & in nullo de his dubitare.*

WHEN then he adds that hitherto 'twas not heard that any person erred on this subject, unless 'twere those who had erred touching Jesus Christ himself. *Quia usque ad præsens nemo deerrasse legitur nisi qui & de Christo erraverunt.* He would say that till then no body had contradicted the Doctrin of the Fathers, leaving it to be understood that then 'twas contradicted, because they contradicted his, which he maintain'd was that of the Fathers. So far we do not find him boasting of the consent of the Church in his time, for we see on the contrary several things which sufficiently denote that he was far from doing it.

AS to the passages of the Liturgy, and words of Christ, he says, that the Priest prays in the Canon in these terms, *Ut fiat Corpus Jesu Christi*, that all the People cry *Amen*, and so the whole Church in every Nation and Language confesses that 'tis this she desires in her Prayer. Whence he draws this consequence, *Unde videat qui contra hoc venire voluerit magis quam credere quid agat contra ipsum Dominum & contra omnem Christi Ecclesiam.* *Nefarium ergo scelus est orare cum amnibus, & non credere quod ipsa veritas testatur, & ubique omnes universaliter verum esse fatentur.* Let those then that had rather contradict this than believe it, consider what they do against the Lord himself and his whole Church. It is then a great fault to pray with all people, and not to believe what the truth it self attests, and what all do universally, and every where confess to be true. His Argument is a Sophism which amounts to this, Our Saviour Christ says 'tis his Body, and the whole Church confesses the same. But they that at this day deny that 'tis his Body

in propriety of nature deny that 'tis his Body. Therefore they contradict Jesus Christ and his Church. Who sees not but there is a great difference between reasoning in this manner, and positively assuring, that the whole Church believes 'tis his Body in propriety of nature? *I will have this*, says Mr. Arnaud to be only a consequence. Are not Authors persuaded of the truth of the consequences which they draw, and do they not offer them for true as positively as their principles? Mr. Arnaud gives an exchange. The question is not whether Paschasius was persuaded of the solidity of his consequence or not, but whether we ought to be persuaded of it our selves, and take it for a testimony touching the publick belief of his time. Mr. Arnaud should know that when a man testifies of a matter of fact, and afterwards draws thence by way of argument, and consequence another fact, he is no farther credible in respect of this latter, but only as his argument or consequence appears just to us. If I say for example that Mr. Arnaud confesses in the first edition of his Book, *That 'tis possible the faithful knew not always so expressly, and universally, whether the Bread did or did not remain in the Sacrament;* and I from hence draw by way of argument and consequence this proposition, *That Mr. Arnaud acknowledges Transubstantiation was not anciently an Article of Faith in the Church.* My testimony in respect of the latter fact will be no farther credible than my consequence will be good. 'Tis the same here. Paschasius assures us, that the whole Church in his time called the Eucharist the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, saying these words, *Ut fiat Corpus dilectissimi filii tui.* So far he acts as a witness, we must believe him. Whence he draws this consequence. That those that do not believe it to be the Body of Jesus Christ in propriety of nature, but only in Sacrament contradict the Church. Here he acts the part of a Disputer, if his arguing be good, we will believe him, if it be a Sophism, we'll not matter it. Now 'tis a sophism; for according to the maxim of S. Augustin, *The Sacraments assume the names of the things of which they are Sacraments*, so that to deny the Eucharist to be the Body of Jesus Christ in propriety of nature, it does not follow a man thereby contradicts the Church which calls it the Body of Jesus Christ.

BUT, adds Mr. Arnaud, 'tis moreover false that this is only a consequence. For this proposition that the whole Church believ'd the Real Presence was included both in the Principle and Conclusion of Paschasius his argument. He concludes, *That those who deny the Real Presence commit an horrid crime in opposing the Faith of the Church.* Here we have it comprehended in the conclusion. Did ever man hear such kind of reasoning? 'Tis false that this is only a consequence, because 'tis a proposition contain'd in the conclusion. This is just as if a man should say 'tis false that it is day. Why? Because the Sun is at his height, for for to be day, and the Sun to be at its height, are not more the same thing, than to be a consequence, and to be a proposition contained in the conclusion of an argument. Are these the prodigious effects of Mr. Arnaud's Logick? And the Principle of this conclusion is, adds he, *not that the Church simply recites these words; Ut fiat Corpus dilectissimi filii tui, but understands them in the sense of the Real Presence.* Which is what I deny. The Principle whereon Paschasius argues is no other than this, That the Priest says, *Ut fiat Corpus dilectissimi filii tui*, and the People answer, *Amen.* That the Church did, or did not understand this of the Real Presence, is what Paschasius does not touch on. He is careful not to advance so far, *Had he known*, says Mr. Arnaud, *that the Church took these words in another sense, he must needs be a mad man to reproach as he does these persons*

for

for being contrary to the sense of the whole Church. He supposes then this for a Principle, that the whole Church took them in the sense of a Real Presence, and consequently supposes she held entirely this Doctrine. This is mere wrangling. *Paschasius* does not say that these persons against whom he inveighs were contrary to the sense of the Church, but only, that they went against the Church, to wit, inasmuch as they went, according to him, contrary to the terms of the Liturgy. Secondly, Whether he did or did not know that the Church took these terms in another sense, 'tis not necessary to enquire, seeing he does not explain himself therein, and speaks neither far or near of the sense of these terms. And 'tis likely he knew there were at least three sorts of persons in the Church, the doubters, the ignorant, and formal adversaries of his Doctrine who took 'em not in this sense. Thirdly, Supposing we say not that *Paschasius* was mad, but argued like a Sophister, what inconvenience will follow; and what shall we say more than appears from the bare reading of his discourse? He would have the Church on his side, what could be more easie, supposing at that time the conversion of substances, and Real Presence were believed, than to proclaim clearly and plainly that the whole Church, Bishops, Religious, the Doctors, and generally all the faithful believed his Doctrine neither more nor less, and there only needed them to be consulted. Articles of Faith of this nature cannot lie hid in a Church which holds them. His Adversaries could not have denied this truth, and had they the impudence to do it they might easily be convinc'd by a million of persons then living. Why had he recourse to arguing and consequences? Why must this consequence be drawn by the hair out of a passage of the Liturgy, which may receive I know not how many explications? Why did he not at least say 'twas certain the Church understood this clause in the sense of a Real Presence? Wherefore was he silent touching the sense, and argued only from the force of these terms, *Corpus dilectissimi filii tui*, &c. as if all those that utter these terms, or add to 'em their *Amen*, believ'd the Real Presence? Which shews us two things, the first, that *Paschasius* acted like a Sophister, sheltering himself as well as he could under the Authority of the Church, against the reproach objected against him of being a Visionary, and an Enthusiast; and the other, that in effect he was an Innovator that had broached a Doctrine unknown to the Church of his time; for had he the advantage which Mr. *Arnaud* supposes he had, which is, that the whole Church was of his opinion, and the people commonly believed the Real Presence and conversion of substances of Bread and Wine, he would not have fail'd to make the best of it, and o'rewhelm his Adversaries with it.

Mr. *ARNAUD* will now then perhaps comprehend that there's a difference between a man that affirms a thing for certain, and of which he himself is a witness, and one that draws a consequence, and perhaps will no longer say, *That my distinction separates by terms which have no sense, that which reason cannot separate*. And at the same time acknowledg, that never pretension was worse grounded than that of the Author of the *Perpetuity*, and his own. They affirm the whole Church was of *Paschasius* his mind. But whereon do they ground their supposition? Were the Adversaries of *Paschasius* agreed about it? No. Does *Paschasius* himself expressly affirm it? No. But 'tis because *Paschasius* insinuates it by an equivocal term which the Church made use of. But does *Paschasius* formally assert, that the Church understood this term in the sense which he gave it? No. But 'tis because *Paschasius* must thus understand it, says Mr. *Arnaud*, to make his reason-



reasoning just. Take away then from *Paschasus* his reasoning the justness which *Mr. Arnaud* would give it, the *subintelligitur* is annull'd, and these Gentlemen bare of proofs.

*THESE* words of *Paschasus*, says *Mr. Arnaud*, *Miror quid volunt quidam nunc dicere non in re esse veritatem carnis Christi vel Sanguinis, sed in Sacramento, virtutem quandam carnis & non carnem*, furnish us with another proof of the same nature. For they shew that this solution of virtue was new, and that *Paschasus* had not learn'd it but of late. *Mr. Arnaud* does well to advertise us that 'tis a proof of the same nature as the others, for 'tis so in effect, that is to say, a very slight one, and scarcely worth offering. *Paschasus* is astonish'd at what his Adversaries say in reference to virtue, not that this solution appears to him new. He says nothing of it in this respect, but because it does not appear to him conformable to these words of *Jesus Christ*, *This is my Body*, nor to these others, *The Bread which I shall give is my Flesh*, nor to these, *He that eats my Flesh, and drinks my Blood, dwells in me, and I in him*. Let but *Mr. Arnaud* read *Paschasus* his Text, and he'll find what I say to be true. *Jesus Christ*, says he, did not say, *this is*, or in this mystery is the virtue or figure of my Body, but he has said without feigning, *This is my Body*. *S. John* introduces likewise our Lord, saying, *the Bread which I shall give is my Flesh*, not another than that which is for the life of the world. And again, *He that eats my Flesh, and drinks my Blood, dwells in me and I in him*. *Unde miror*, adds he, *quid velint, &c.* What can be concluded hence for the novelty of this solution of virtue?

*IN fine*, *Frudegard* himself, says moreover *Mr. Arnaud*, to whom *Paschasus* wrote about the latter part of his life to remove some doubts he had on this mystery may serve further to confute the falsity of *Mr. Claude's* fable, who pretends no body could have the idea of the Real Presence unless he took it from *Paschasus* his Book. *Dicis*, says *Paschasus*, to him, *te sic antea credidisse, & in libro quem de Sacramentis edidi ita legisse, sed presiteris postea te in libro tertio de doctrina Christiana B. Augustini legisse quod tropica sit locutio*. *Mr. Arnaud* will have these words, *Dicis te sic antea credidisse*, to denote that the Doctrin of the Real Presence was the Faith in which he had been brought up, and that the following, *Et in libro quem de Sacramentis edidi ita legisse*, denote that the reading of *Paschasus* his Book had confirm'd him in it. But who knows not that in these kind of discourses the Particle *Et*, is very often a Particle which explains, or gives the reason of what was before said, and not that which distinguishes, as I have already observ'd in another place. He would only say that before he thus believed it, having so read it in *Paschasus* his Book. And that *Mr. Arnaud's* subtilty might take place, he must have said, not that he had thus believ'd it before; but thus believ'd it from the beginning, in his youth, that he afterwards thus found it in *Paschasus* his Book, who had confirm'd him in his belief, but that afterwards he had found in *S. Austin* that 'twas a figurative locution. In this manner he had distinguish'd the three terms of *Mr. Arnaud*, whereas he distinguishes but two, *antea*, and *postea*, and as to the first, he says he had thus believ'd it, and thus read it in *Paschasus* his Book, denoting by this second clause the place where he drew this Faith. Page 857.

AND these are *Mr. Arnaud's* objections, but having examin'd them, 'twill not be amiss to represent the conclusion he draws from 'em. *I do not believe*, says he; that having considered all these proofs seriously one can ima-  
gin

gin, that Paschasus in declaring the Eucharist to be the true Flesh of Jesus Christ assum'd of the Virgin, has propos'd a new Doctrin. Neither can I believe that amongst the Calvinists themselves any but Mr. Claude will be so obstinate as to maintain so evident a falsity, and one so likely to demonstrate to the world the excessive boldness of some of their Ministers. Thus does Mr. Arnaud wipe his Sword after his victory. Can you but think he has offered the most convincing proofs imaginable, oblig'd us to be everlastingly silent, and that the Minister Claude must be a strange kind of a man, seeing he alone of all his party will be able to harden himself against such puissant demonstrations and clear discoveries.

## C H A P. IX.

*Proofs that Paschasus was an Innovator.*

**I** SAID in the preceding Chapter that the best way to be informed whether Paschasus has been an Innovator, was to search whether those that went before him, and wrote on the same subject, have, or have not taught the same thing as he has done, I repeat it here, to the end it may be considered whether after the discussion which Mr. Aubertin has made of the Doctrin of the Ancients, and what I have wrote also thereupon either to the Author of the *Perpetuity*, or Father Noüet, or Mr. Arnaud, we have not right to suppose, and to suppose as we do with confidence, that no body before Paschasus taught the conversion of the substances of Bread and Wine, or substantial Presence of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist. Whence it follows he was the first that brought this new Doctrin into the world.

**BUT** besides this proof which is an essential and fundamental one, we shall offer several others, taken from the circumstances of this History which do much illustrate this truth. The first of this rank is taken from Paschasus himself's acknowledging he moved several persons to understand this mystery. *Altho I wrote nothing worth the Reader's perusal in my Book which I dedicated cuilibet puero* (I had rendred these words to a young man, because that in effect his Book was dedicated to Placidus. Mr. Arnaud would have it rendred to young people, this is no great matter) yet am I inform'd that I have excited several persons to understand this mystery. Now this shews that before his Book came forth his Doctrin was unknown, whereunto we may also add the passages wherein he declares how the Church was ignorant of this mystery, as we have already observ'd.

**TO** judg rightly of the strength of this proof, and to defend it against Mr. Arnaud's vain objections we should first shew what kind of ignorance, and intelligence Paschasus here means. For Mr. Arnaud has wonderful distinctions on this subject. *Ought not Mr. Claude to know*, says he, *that besides this knowledg common to all Christians which makes 'em believe the mysteries without much reflection, there is another clearer one, and which is often denoted in S. Austin by the word intelligence, which does not precede, but follows Faith, as being the fruit and recompence of it, sic accipite, sic credite,* says

says this Father, *Ut mereamini intelligere, fides enim debet præcedere intellectum ut sit intellectus fidei præmium.* As then all Christians believe the mysteries, they believed likewise all of 'em the Eucharist in Paschasus his time in the same manner as we believe it, (which is to say that they all believ'd the Real Presence and Transubstantiation) but they had not all of 'em an understanding of it, that is to say, they had not all considered this adorable Sacrament, with the application which it deserves, That they did not all know the mysteries contained in the Symbols, the relations of the Eucharist with the Sacraments of the ancient Law, the ends which God had in appointing them, those that have right to partake of 'em, the dispositions with which a man ought to approach to 'em, the greatness of their crime who profane the Lords Body, and the rest of those things which are explained in Paschasus his Book. All this is contained under the word *intelligence*, and he comprehends it therein himself in explaining afterwards what he means by this term, and by making an abridgment of his whole Book without marking in particular the Real Presence. The question then is, whether in Paschasus his sense the ignorance, and consequently the intelligence he speaks of do not extend as far as the Real Presence. Now this is what will be soon decided if we examin the passages themselves of this Author without suffering our selves to be blinded by Mr. Arnaud's illusions. At the entrance of his second Chapter, wherein he declares his design to dissipate this ignorance, and remedy the evils it caused, he describes it in this manner, *Sacramentum Dominici Corporis & Sanguinis quod quotidie in Ecclesia celebratur, nemo fidelium ignorare debet, nemo nescire quid ad fidem, quidve ad scientiam in eo pertineat.* Will you then know what kind of ignorance this was, Paschasus tells you immediately, *Nescire quid ad fidem quidve ad scientiam pertineat.* Here are precisely the two parts of Mr. Arnaud's distinction contained in the definition which Paschasus gives of it. For *nescire quid ad fidem pertineat*, is not to have this knowledg which makes me believe the mysteries without much reflection, and *nescire quid ad scientiam*, is not to have this other clearer knowledg which Mr. Arnaud calls particularly *intelligence*. So that Paschasus and his Commentator are not at all agreed. Paschasus extends the ignorance he speaks of to the things which relate to Faith, which is to say, according to him, the Real Presence, and Mr. Arnaud restrains it to other things. But let us hear Paschasus further, *Fides, says he, est erudienda ne forte ob hoc censeamur indigni, si non satis discernimus illud; nec intelligimus mysticum Christi Corpus & sanguis quanta polleat dignitate quantaque præmineat virtute.* We must instruct our Faith, lest for want of doing it we be reputed unworthy in not sufficiently discerning this Sacrament, and understanding the excellent virtue and dignity of it. Can any man explain himself more clearly? The ignorance consists in not well understanding the great dignity of the mystical Body of Jesus Christ, which in his sense signifies not to know, that 'tis the proper substance of the Body of Jesus Christ born of the Virgin, and th' intelligence on the contrary consists in knowing it. But to take away from Mr. Arnaud all pretence of the validity of his distinction, observe here what Paschasus adds afterwards. *He receives the Sacrament ignorantly who is wholly ignorant of its virtue and dignity, and knows not the circumstance of it, and does not truly know that 'tis the Body and Blood of our Lord, according to truth, altho it be taken in the Sacrament by Faith.* Mr. Arnaud will not deny that in the stile of Paschasus to be the Body and Blood of our Lord according to truth, is to be it substantially and really. Now the ignorance consists in the not knowing this, and by the reason of contraries the intelligence consists in knowing it according to Paschasus.

Paschas. de  
Corp. & Sang.  
Dom. cap. 2.

E e e e

Mr. AR-



Mr. ARNAUD will say without doubt that *Paschasus* in all this whole second Chapter, intended only to shew the necessity there is of instructing persons before they come to receive the Communion, but that he does not suppose this ignorance was actually in the Church; and that on the contrary, this necessity of instruction, in the manner which he exaggerates, denotes that they took a great care in those days to teach the Communicants the Doctrine of the Real Presence. But this evasion will not serve turn. For besides that *Paschasus* says expressly, *That he receives the Sacrament ignorantly that knows not 'tis the Body and Blood of our Lord according to truth*; which is an expression of a man which acknowledges there are actually persons that thus receive the Sacrament: Besides this a man needs only read the passages of his Letter to *Frudegard*, where it cannot be denied but he speaks of ignorant persons which were then actually in the Church; I say, there needs no more than the reading 'em to find he understands this same ignorance which he had describ'd in the second Chapter of his Book. For having immediately proposed, as from the part of *Frudegard*, the objection taken from a passage of *S. Austin*, That the Sacrament is called the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ by a figurative locution, *Quod tropica locutio sit ut Corpus Christi & Sanguis esse dicatur*, which respects as every one sees the Article of the Real Presence; and having endeavoured to satisfy it, he passes over to another objection, which respects the same Real Presence. *Multi*, says he, *ex hoc dubitant quomodo ille integer manet, & hoc Corpus Christi & Sanguis esse possit*. Several doubt because they cannot comprehend how Jesus Christ remains entire, and yet the Sacrament to be his Body and Blood. He answers this Objection as well as he can, then immediately adds, *Here you have, dear Brother, what came into my thoughts at present, and because you are one part of my self, I believe I ought not to conceal any thing from you, altho I cannot express my mind in this particular as 'tis necessary. As to your self, I desire you would read over again my Book touching this matter, which you say you have heretofore read, and if you find therein anything reprehensible or doubtful, refuse not the labor of reading it again. For altho I have not written anything worth the Readers pains in a Book which I dedicated to young people, yet am I inform'd that I have stirred up several persons to the understanding of this mystery. Who sees not that in all this his whole scope is the Real Presence. His whole preceding dispute was on this Article, and these terms, If you find in my Book anything reprehensible or doubtful, can only relate to the same Article, for there was no question of anything else. When then he adds, That he has stirr'd up several persons to the understanding of this mystery, 'tis clear that he has respect to the same thing, and means he has rescued several from th' ignorance wherein they lay touching the Doctrine of the Real Presence.*

BUT to leave no room for contradiction and cavil, I need only represent what he writes towards the end of this same Letter, where having said he has confirm'd his Doctrine by the testimonies of Pope Gregory, the Council of *Ephesus*, *S. Jerom* and some others, he adds, *Et ideo quamvis ex hoc quidam de ignorantia errent nemo tamen est, &c. Altho some do err thro ignorance in this point. What can be said to this? Here we have formally an actual ignorance on the Article of the Real Presence, on the same Article which was disputed him by his Adversaries, on the same Article on which he produc'd the words of Jesus Christ, This is my Body, and the clause of the Liturgy, Ut fiat Corpus & Sanguis, dilectissimi filii tui Domini nostri Jesu*

*Jesu Christi*, on the same Article whereon he had alledged several passages of the Fathers, *Quamvis*, says he, *ex hoc quidam de ignorantia errant*.

DOES any man desire another exprefs and formal testimony of *Paschasius*; I need only produce these words of his Commentary on the 26th. of *S. Matthew* to satisfie him. *I have been more large on this subject of our Lords Supper than the brevity of a Commentary permits, because there are several that have another sentiment touching these mystical things, and several are so blind as to think the Bread and Wine are nothing else but what we see with our eyes, and tast with our mouths.* Here we have then actually persons that did not believe the Real Presence, and those not inconsiderable for their number, seeing he denotes them by the term of several, and which he expresses so clearly that Mr. *Arnaud* will be at a loss what to answer.

Mr. *ARNAUD* who well perceived he might be opposed on the first answer, bethought himself of giving us another, in which, contrary to his usual manner, he relaxes something of what he advanced. *Not but that*, says Bo. k 2. ch. 10. p. 852. he, this word *intelligence* may likewise respect the Real Presence, not as a new truth, but as a truth which might be fuller comprehended, and in a manner which penetrates more lively the heart; for there are several degrees of growing in the knowledg of a mystery which one believes already by Faith. He would say there might be people who knew less strongly, and livelily the Real Presence, and that in this respect they might acquire the intelligence of it; but that there were none that were wholly ignorant of it, or to whom *Paschasius* his Book gave the intelligence of it as of a new truth. But *Paschasius* himself refutes this gloss, *Quamvis ex hoc quidam de ignorantia errant*. This is an ignorance which according to him extends so far as the making 'em err in the Article of the Real Presence. To err in an Article thro ignorance, is it not a not believing of it at all, as having never heard it mentioned? Is not this a knowing nothing of it, a having no knowledg, and consequently no Faith in it? Now such were *Paschasius* his ignorant persons, who were far different from those of Mr. *Arnaud*. In a word, they were people who thought the Bread and Wine were nothing else in respect of their substance, than what they appear to our eyes and tast, as *Paschasius* now spake.

THIS Principle being well establish'd, as I believe it is at present, 'twill be no hard matter to see the consequence of it. The Author of the *Perpetuity* and Mr. *Arnaud* affirm as an undoubted truth that all the faithful Communicants have ever had a distinct knowledg either of the Real Presence, or Real Absence; of the Presence, if it were taught in the Church, of the Absence, if the Presence were not therein taught. Whereupon I raise this Argument. There cannot be any person in a Church wherein the Real Presence is commonly taught, but knows distinctly the Real Presence. Now in the Church of the 9th. Century, at which time *Paschasius* lived, there were people that were ignorant of the Real Presence, and erred in this Article thro ignorance. Therefore in the Church of the 9th. Century the Real Presence was not commonly taught. The first proposition is of the Author of the *Perpetuity* and Mr. *Arnaud*, without distinction or restriction; the second is of *Paschasius* himself: the conclusion of it I think then is inevitable.

'T WILL be reply'd that this Argument is one of those called, *ad hominem*, which does indeed press an adversary by his own proper Principles, but which are not always absolutely conclusive, because it may happen that the Principles of an Adversary on which they are grounded be false and imprudently offered. This Argument then may be convictive against the Author of the *Perpetuity* and Mr. *Arnaud*. But the Principle of Mr. *Arnaud* and the Author of the *Perpetuity* may be false, and consequently the conclusion I draw thence.

TO solve this difficulty, besides that 'tis a great advantage for the cause which I defend, that as able Doctors as these Gentlemen remain convict by their own proper Principles. 'Tis to be observ'd that theirs being alternative, must be distinguish'd into two propositions; one of which is, *All the Communicants have had a distinct knowledge of the Real Presence if the Church of their time taught it.* And the other, *All the Communicants have had a distinct knowledge of the Real Absence, if the Church of their time did not teach the Real Presence.* In respect of this second proposition the Principle is false, as I have shew'd in my Answer to the *Perpetuity*, and in the beginning of his 6th. Book, in I think an unanswerable manner. But in respect of the first the Principle is true, and must be granted, for in effect it is not conceivable that a Church should believe and teach commonly that what we receive in the Communion is the proper substance of the Body of Jesus Christ; and yet let persons of age Communicate without instructing them in it; That she should believe and teach a man must adore this Sacrament which we receive, publicly practise this supreme Adoration, and yet one part of the Communicants know nothing of it, and in this respect err thro ignorance. It is then clear that my argument is not barely one of those term'd *ad hominem*, seeing 'tis not grounded on the second proposition of these Gentlemen's Principle, which is in contest, but on the first in which both sides are agreed: so that my conclusion has all the strength and truth that can be desired in every respect.

Book 8. ch. 10.  
p. 859.

NEVERTHELESS we must answer two of Mr. *Arnaud*'s minute objections. *Paschasius* says, *That he dedicated his Book to young People.* 'Tis then, says he, unlikely, that *Paschasius* design'd to instruct the whole world in a truth of which he believ'd both the learned and unlearn'd were ignorant. I answer, 'twas not indeed likely that he had immediately so vast a design. 'Tis more likely he propos'd his Doctrin as he himself says, *petentibus*; to his Scholars who pray'd him to shew them his sentiment in this matter; but this does not hinder his Doctrin from being new. He says, says Mr. *Arnaud* again, *That he had not written any thing worth his Readers pains.* Now no man who discovers a mystery of this importance uses such humble expressions which suppose he says nothing but what's vulgarly known. Mr. *Arnaud* deceives himself; for besides what I intimated in several places, that those who introduce new Opinions by way of addition, or explication of the ancient ones do not openly declare 'em to be new, but on the contrary endeavour to make 'em slip in by means of received expressions; besides this, I say, this humility of *Paschasius* relates not to the things themselves which he wrote, nor his sentiment; for he could not term them scarcely worth his Readers perusal; whether they were new, or not. But this relates to the manner of writing 'em, according to what he says to *Frudegard*, *Celare non debui quæ loqui ut oportuit minime potui.*

BUT



BUT pass we on to the second proof, which shews *Paschasus* to be an Innovator. 'Tis taken from the effect which his Doctrin produced in several persons minds, which was, that they opposed him. *I have discoursed,* Comment in Matth. 25. *says he, of these things more at large, because I am informed some people have blamed me, as if (in the Book which I publish'd of the Sacraments of Christ, I would give more to his words than they will bear, or establish something else than the truth promises.* These censurers proceed further, for they opposed a contrary Doctrin against that of *Paschasus*, to wit, that 'twas the Body of Jesus Christ, *in figure, in Sacrament, in virtue.* Which *Paschasus* himself tells us. *Let those, says he, that will extenuate this term of Body bear,* ibid. *They that tell us 'tis not the true Flesh of Christ which is now celebrated in the Sacrament in the Church, nor his true Blood. They tell us, or rather feign I know not what, as if 'twere a certain virtue of the Flesh and Blood.* He afterwards repeats two or three times the same thing. They proceeded so far as to accuse *Paschasus* of Enthusiasm, twitting him with having a young mans vision, as we remark'd in the foregoing Chapter. For this is what may be justly collected from these words to *Frudegard.* *You have at the end of this Book the sentiments of the Catholick Fathers which I briefly marked, that you may know that 'tis not thro an Enthusiasm of rashness that I have had these Visions, being as yet a young man.* Supposing *Paschasus* taught nothing but what the whole Church believ'd and commonly taught the Faithful, whence I pray you came these Censurers? The whole world lived peaceably during eight hundred years in the belief of the Real Presence; all the Preachers taught it, all Books contain'd it, all the Faithful believ'd it and distinctly knew it; there not having been any body yet that dared contradict it: and yet there appear persons who precisely oppose it as soon as *Paschasus* appeared in the world. But who so well and quickly furnish'd 'em with the Keys of *figure and virtue* which Mr. *Arnaud* would have had all the world to be ignorant of, and th' invention of which he attributes to the Ministers. Why if we will believe him they were people that dared not appear openly, that whispered secretly in mens ears, and yet were so well instructed that they knew the principal distinctions of the Calvinists and all the subtilties of their School. But moreover, what fury possessed them to attack thus particularly *Paschasus* who said nothing but what all the world knew, even the meanest Christian, and what all the world believ'd, and who moreover had no particular contest with them? They could not be ignorant that the whole Church was of this opinion, supposing she really did hold it; for as I already said, the Doctrin of the Real Presence is a popular Doctrin. It is not one of those Doctrins which lie hid in Books or the Schools, which the learned can only know. 'Tis a Doctrin which each particular person knows if he knows any thing. Why then must *Paschasus* be thus teas'd? If they had a design to trouble the peace of the Church, why did they not attack its Doctrin, or in general those that held it, which is to say, according to Mr. *Arnaud*, the whole world. Why again must *Paschasus* be rather set upon than any body else? Does Mr. *Arnaud* believe this to be very natural? Are people wont to set upon a particular person, to the exclusion of all others, when he has said no more than what others have said, and what is taught and held by every body? Is such a one liable to reproaches and censures? Are we wont to charge such a one with Enthusiastical rashness and pretence to Visions? It is clear people do not deal thus but with persons that have gone out of the beaten road, and would introduce novelties in the Church. 'Tis such as these

these whom we are wont to accuse, to censure and call Enthusiasts and Visionaries, and not those that neither vary from the common terms or sentiments.

Lib. 8. Ch. 10.  
p. 861, 862.

TO elude the force of this proof Mr. Arnaud has recourse to his Chronology. He says that the last eight Books of *Paschasus* his Commentaries on *S. Matthew* were not written till thirty years after his Book *De Corpore & Sanguine Domini*. That he speaks therein of his Censurers as persons that reprehended him at the very time he wrote this Commentary, *Mirror quid volunt nunc quidam dicere*, and that it does not appear he was reprehended before; seeing he did not attempt to defend himself. Whence he concludes, *That this Book which Mr. Claude says offended the whole world as soon as 'twas made, was publish'd near thirty years before 'twas censur'd by any body.*

I have already replied to this Chronology of Mr. Arnaud. Supposing there were in effect thirty years between *Paschasus* his Book, and the Censures of his Adversaries, 'twill not hence follow that his Doctrine received a general approbation during these thirty years, for perhaps this Book was not known, or considered by those that were better able to judge of it than others. Printing which now immediately renders a Book publick, was not in use in those times; and 'tis likely Transcribers were not in any great haste to multiply the Book of a young Religious of *Corbie*, which he at first intended only for his particular friends. Supposing this Book was known, it might be neglected thro contempt, or some other consideration, as it oft happens in these cases, altho a Book may contain several absurd and extraordinary Opinions; because it may not be thought fitting to make 'em publick, till it afterwards appears there are persons who be deceiv'd by it, and that 'tis necessary to undeceive them. Moreover, what reason is there to say, that the censures of these people hapned not before the time wherein *Paschasus* wrote his Commentary on *S. Matthew*? 'Tis because, says Mr. Arnaud, he says, *Mirror quid volunt quidam nunc dicere*. But this reason is void, for this term *nunc* according to the common stile of Authors does refer it self rather in general to the time in which *Paschasus* lived, than precisely to that in which he wrote his Commentary. And as to what Mr. Arnaud adds, *That it does not appear he was reprehended before, seeing he did not attempt to defend himself.* This concludes nothing, unless we suppose that *Paschasus* was in a capacity, and in humor, to defend himself as soon as he knew he was censured. Now this supposition must be proved before it be offered as a thing certain, for this supposition does not establish it self. How many persons are there who having set forth singular opinions, do for a long time patiently undergo all censures and reprehensions without replies, in expectation of a convenient time to defend themselves. *Paschasus* had begun his Commentary on *S. Matthew* a great while before he became Abbot; 'tis probable he was willing to stay till the explication of these words, *This is my Body*, which he believed so advantageous to his cause should furnish him with an occasion to speak of his sentiment, and to defend it against the attacks of opposers. So that Mr. Arnaud's Chronology for this time will stand him in no stead.

Page 868.

WHO has given this liberty, adds he, to Mr. Claude to give the name of world to these unknown persons, of whom *Paschasus* only heard some mention, but who never contradicted him to his face, nor ever wrote against him? This term cannot be reasonably used but to denote the greatest part of Christians, or  
at

at least those who had read Paschasus his Book. Now it is exceeding false in this sense that the world was astonish'd at Paschasus his Book, seeing none of his Friends, none of his Society, none of those with whom he met in Ecclesiastick Assemblies and Councils, have formally reprehended him for it.

BUT who has given Mr. Arnaud Authority to attribute the name of *unknown persons* to Paschasus his Adversaries, and to say thereupon what he says, seeing he has no grounds for it, as I have already shew'd? Who told him that John Scot, Bertram and Raban, who were not obscure persons in the Church of the 9th. Century, have staid till Paschasus his death before they declared themselves against his Opinion, supposing 'twere true they did not write till after his Death, which is very uncertain? Who has given him power to conclude, That the world was not astonish'd at Paschasus his Book, under pretence it does not appear, That he was formally reprehended about it, neither amongst his own Society, nor in the Ecclesiastical Assemblies, nor Councils, seeing it does no more appear, that Bertram and Raban, when they taught a contrary Doctrine to that of Paschasus, have been formally reprehended for it, either by any one of their Order, or in the publick Assemblies, or Councils wherein they assisted? Who has given him right to say, as he does, that the world of whom I speak consists of some small number of rash and troublesome Disputers, who privately blamed what they dared not contradict in publick? I shall not here repeat what I have already observed, That 'tis absurd to endeavour to make us conceive the Adversaries of Paschasus his Doctrine as persons that blamed in secret what they dared not contradict in publick; seeing the Gentlemen of the Roman Church are forced to acknowledge, at least that after the death of Paschasus, there were publick Writings against this very Doctrine, and of which writings the Authors being famous men, did not at all conceal their names; as if the reason of this pretended fear depended not on the Doctrine, but person of Paschasus, who must have been at this rate the terror of Ecclesiastical Writers, whilst he liv'd. I shall only say that Mr. Arnaud has no reason to reduce Paschasus his Adversaries, that is to say, those who would not receive his Doctrine to a small number. One may in truth reasonably suppose, that amongst those that rejected this novelty, there were some that made head, or appeared more than the rest; and in this sense Paschasus might say that he understood some reprehended him. But to conclude hence that these were the only persons of their party, and that all the rest of the Church follow'd the sentiment of Paschasus, is a groundless fancy. Raban speaking of Paschasus his party, calls 'em formally some, *Quidam*, says he, *nuper de ipso Sacramento Corporis & Sanguinis Domini non rite sentientes dixerunt hoc ipsum Corpus & Sanguinem Domini quod de Maria Virgine natum est.* And the anonymous Author which Cellot the Jesuit has caused to be Printed expresses himself in the same manner on this subject. Some, says he, say that what is received from the Altar is the same thing as that which was born of the Virgin. Others deny it and say 'tis another thing. Paschasus himself formally acknowledges, that those who were not of his opinion, were not a small number; for he describes them under the name of several or many: *Ideo*, says he, *in hac cœna Christi prolixius elaboravi quam brevitatis poscat tractatoris quia in his mysticis rebus plures aliud sapiunt.*

Pœnitent. Rab.  
cap. 33.

AS oft, says Mr. Arnaud, as a difficult mystery is proposed, altho believ'd universally by the Faithful, in a manner which causes a greater application of Spirit,



*Spirit, those mens minds which are not sufficiently humble, are likely to be dismayed at it, and to endeavour by their reason to find out ways whereby to avoid the difficulties which they cannot bear. And thereupon they often set upon, the person who has proposed it to 'em endeavouring to distinguish him from the rest of the faithful. Even sometimes these ill opinions be already formed. For there are found too oft persons in the very bosom of the Church, who giving too great liberty to their thoughts and reflections, conceive ideas of mysteries different enough from those which the other faithful have of 'em, in turning to their sense most of the common expressions. And hence it happens, that if any one else in following the common notions uses any term which they also cannot reduce to their particular sense, they charge this person with boldness and rashness. And this is properly what we have reason to believe hapned in Paschasius his time.*

DOES Mr. Arnaud think to escape by these circuits and artifices: A difficult mystery, says he, *believed universally by the Faithful is proposed in such a manner as makes people apply themselves the more to it.* Does he pretend Paschasius had said any thing which is new in his Book concerning the Real Presence to make men consider more that point, supposing it believ'd universally by the Faithful? Does Paschasius examin the consequences of it, or exaggerate the miraculousness of it, or offer several objections on the contrary? He does nothing of all this. But only says 'tis the same Flesh of Christ which was born of the Virgin and rose again: That the substance of Bread is converted into the true Body of Jesus Christ, altho the colour and savour of Bread remains: That the substance of Christs Body enters into our flesh. Now this is what all the Faithful universally believed and held distinctly according to Mr. Arnaud. *As all Christians believe the mysteries,* said he, three pages before, *so they likewise all believ'd the Eucharist in Paschasius his time in the same manner as we believe it.* They all then believ'd that 'tis the same substance of the Body of Jesus Christ, which he assum'd of the Virgin, and which is now in Heaven, and that the substance of the Bread is converted into it; yet without any change either in the tast, or colour of the Bread. What has Paschasius done to make 'em more mind it? *Those mens minds,* adds Mr. Arnaud, *which are not sufficiently humble are apt to startle, and endeavour by their reason to find out ways whereby to shun the difficulties which they cannot bear.* Whence should this startling come, supposing they believed of the Eucharist what is commonly believed at this day of it in the Church of Rome? Did they never hear say before that they received in the Communion the proper substance of the Flesh of Jesus Christ, born of the Virgin, dead and buried, nor that the substance of Bread is converted into this substance? If 'twere a novelty, as to them, they did not then believe Transubstantiation, nor the Real Presence; for 'tis precisely in these ideas wherein these Doctrins do consist; and if it be this particular manner of proposing the mystery which affrights them, it must be necessarily acknowledg'd either that they were strangers to these ideas before, or that they had been till that time very stupid and drowsie, seeing they felt not the least trouble about it, altho they had 'em always before their eyes; whereas now a simple proposal of the same things, without any objection, without exaggeration, affrights, and constrains them to find out by their reason ways whereby to avoid the difficulties which they cannot bear. And then they commonly set upon him who proposed it to 'em, endeavouring to distinguish him from the rest of the faithful. Which is to say, that they then lose their senses. For 'tis mere madness to set particularly upon

*Paschasius*

*Paschasus*, who only propos'd to 'em in a manner the most simple imaginable, if we will believe *Mr. Arnaud*, without either Preface, says he, *artificial method, or disguise*, what the whole Church believ'd, and what they believe themselves. Even sometimes these ill opinions are already formed. Here *Mr. Arnaud* acknowledges one part of the truth. For the truth is, that these people here mention'd never heard of the novelties of *Paschasus*. They knew only that the Eucharist was the Body of Jesus Christ in Figure, in Sacrament, and in Virtue, as they themselves explain'd their sense about it; and this was the true cause of their astonishment, and the only reason for which they accus'd *Paschasus* of Enthusiasms and Visions. But let *Mr. Arnaud* explain, if he pleases, in what manner according to him these persons lived in the Communion of the Church. They turn'd to their own sense, says he, most of the common expressions. How happens it *Mr. Arnaud*, who but the last moment could not suffer me to say *Paschasus* abused an expression of the Church, and turn'd it to another sense, now comprehended well enough, that this whole Party turn'd to their sense most of the common expressions? He that told us that *Paschasus* would be a mad man should he make use of this expression had he known the Church understood it in another sense, will grant at present that these persons accommodated the greatest part of the Churches expressions to their sense, without troubling themselves with the sense wherein the Church understood them? *Mr. Arnaud's* Argument is like *Aristotle's prima materia*, capable of any form at divers times. Does his interest require the Churches expressions to be abused? This may be done, there are reasons for it. Does the same interest require that it be a senseless thing to abuse 'em: This cannot be, and the reasons on the contrary are not wanting. For in fine, either these people were ignorant of the true sense in which the Church understood these expressions, or they were not. If they were ignorant of it, *Paschasus* might be as well ignorant of it as they. If they were not ignorant of it, and yet abused it, *Paschasus* might as well do the same, contrary to his own knowledge. They turn'd to their sense most of the usual expressions. It seems that *Mr. Arnaud* by this supposes there were some of these expressions which might be turn'd by them. Yet he adds; And hence it happens that if any other person in following the ordinary notions makes use of any terms which they cannot in the same manner reduce to their particular sense, they charge this person with rashness. This discourse thus couch'd has no coherence, for if amongst the ordinary expressions there remain'd still some of 'em, which they could not reduce to their sense, why must they set upon *Paschasus* in particular, who not only follow'd the sense of the Church, but also her expressions, to wit, those which were too plain and full to be perverted? Why must he then be accus'd of rashness? 'Tis evident *Mr. Arnaud* stood upon Thorns, when he wrote this Answer. A reason must be given why these persons before us reprehended *Paschasus* in particular, and accus'd him of being a rash person. Now there cannot be naturally any other but this, That *Paschasus* had propos'd a new Doctrine in the Church which was never before heard of; having asserted the Eucharist to be the same Flesh of Jesus Christ born of the Virgin, dead and risen again. *Mr. Arnaud* to avoid the making of this Confession, supposes there were a party in the Church that did not believe the Real Presence; he will have these persons turn to their sense the common expressions; but not being able to do the same with that of *Paschasus*, this was the reason why they set upon him in particular, and accus'd him of rashness. To make this answer pass current, it must be necessarily supposed that the expressions of *Paschasus* were peculiarly of this nature,

nature, that they could not be turn'd to the sense of these people, and that this was their particular character which distinguish'd them from all the common expressions, for a reason must be found why they set particularly upon *Paschasus* as a rash person, and this reason must be something that was singular in *Paschasus*. But to acknowledg this frankly and clearly *Mr. Arnaud* must engage himself in terrible ill conveniencies, for this would be an acknowledging there was not any thing in the common expressions of the Church at that time which was expressly for the Real Presence, and which might not be turn'd to another sense; which is to say, that all the common expressions were general, equivocal, and ambiguous. By this means he would have expoed himself to abundance of questions, as amongst others to these, Whence *Paschasus* could know the Church believ'd the Real Presence, seeing all her expressions were capable of another sense. Whence he knew the Church understood these expressions in one sense rather than in another, seeing she never express'd her self about 'em in a clear and incapable manner of being perverted. Who has given liberty to *Paschasus* to determin what the Church did not determin, and t' express in particular terms what the Church only express'd in general ones? *Mr. Arnaud* who plainly foresaw these inconveniencies, has thought best to expose himself in an ænigmatical manner, as those generally do who on one hand are urged by the force of truth and sequel of their own arguing, but who on the other are retain'd by the fear of saying too much. They pervert, says he, to their sense most of the common expressions, And hence it happens, that if any body else in following the common notions, makes use of any term which they cannot in the same manner reduce to their particular sense, they accuse this person of rashness. This is exactly what we have reason to believe hapned in *Paschasus* his time. Here's exactly the description of a man that lies, but fears to be taken in flying, and therefore provides for himself another evasion against all occasions.

Lib. de Corp.  
& Sang. Dom.

MY third proof is taken from *Paschasus* his proposing his Opinion in the manner of a paradox which must ravish the world with admiration. *Altho these things*, says he, *have the figure of Bread and Wine, yet must we believe that they are nothing else after Consecration than the Flesh and Blood of Jesus Christ. And therefore the truth it self said to his Disciples, This is my Flesh for the life of the world. And to explain my self in a more wonderful manner. Et ut mirabilis loquar, 'tis entirely nothing else but the Flesh which was born of the Virgin and suffered on the Cross, and is risen from the Sepulchre. These terms ut mirabilis loquar, are the expression of one that pretends to say something extraordinary and surprizing.*

Book 8. ch. 10.  
p. 863.

*Mr. ARNAUD* answers, *That all Miracles are not Paradoxes: I grant it, and therefore they are not all express'd in this manner, ut mirabilis loquar. Did S. Chrysostom*, adds he, *offer a Paradox when he broke forth into this expression concerning the Eucharist, O wonderful! he that is at the right hand of God is between the hands of the Priests? I answer, that in effect this discourse of Chrysostom is a true Paradox, a Paradox of an Orator, which seems at first to contradict common sense, altho that in effect being rightly understood it does not; but that of Paschasus is a false Paradox, because it opposed in effect and at bottom not only common sense, but likewise truth. As to what remains, I know not why Mr. Arnaud will have these terms translated, ut mirabilis loquar, by these. The better to explain to you this marvel. The Rules of Grammar must be changed to*  
favour



favour this Translation, *ut mirabilis loquar*, naturally signifies, *to speak, or explain my self in a more admirable manner*, or at most, *to say something more admirable*, which is to say, that the expression which he was going to use, or the thing it self which he was about to speak, was extraordinary and surprizing. Now this shews he acknowledg'd at least that his expressions or conceptions were new, whence 'tis not difficult to conjecture that his Doctrin was as new as his expressions.

WE may make another conjecture from his submitting his Doctrin to the judgment of *Frudegard*, and intreating him to see what is reprehensible in it. He tells him he sends to him his Commentary on the 26. of *S. Matthew*, and adds, *Ut ex ipso considerare queas, quid intelligibilis credendum sit, vel quid in me reprehendum cum charitate*, *To the end that you may know what is more rationally to be believed, or what there is in me that may be charitably blamed*. Mr. *Arnaud* is mistaken if he believes I ground my conjecture in general on this deference of humility which *Paschasus* had for *Frudegard*. We know that wise Authors are wont to acknowledge themselves liable to mistakes, and submit themselves to the censures of their friends. 'Tis not this. Here is something more particular which I desire may be considered. *Paschasus* declares in his Letter that he was censured for teaching the Real Presence, and taking the words of our Lord in a wrong sense. Even *Frudegard* himself proposes to him an objection against his Doctrin, he defends himself the best he can, he desires *Frudegard* to read his Book over often, he sends to him his Commentary on *S. Matthew*, wherein he treats of the same thing, and leaves *Frudegard* to the liberty of his judgment, to see what may be more rationally believ'd, or what may be charitably reprehended in him, *Quid intelligibilis credendum sit, vel quid in me reprehendum cum charitate*. Who sees not the question is only of the Real Presence, and that what he submits to the judgment of *Frudegard* is to know which is most reasonable, either to believe it, or not to believe it; to know whether it be, or be not worthy of reprehension to have offer'd it. But who does not likewise see that this cannot be the language of a man that taught nothing but what the Church then believed; for people do not thus submit the Faith of the whole Church, and such a clear, certain, and undeniable Faith, as Mr. *Arnaud* supposes this was, to the judgment of a particular person, leaving him at liberty to take that part which he finds most reasonable, and that of reprehending him, that is to say of censuring him, provided he does it with charity.

Mr. *ARNAUD* reckons for my 6th. proof this, *That Paschasus does never vaunt this his Doctrin was formally that of the whole Church*. This remark consists in a fact which we have already discuss'd, and found to be true. I need only add, that if ever man was oblig'd loudly to offer, and without hesitation, the formal consent of the Church of his time, and to protest he had said nothing but what all the Bishops, and Religious of his time spake in conformity with him, and what all the Faithful made profession to believe with him, 'twas *Paschasus*. He was set upon in particular, he was reprehended for ill expounding the words of Christ, his Doctrin was opposed by a contrary Doctrin, he was accused for being a rash person, a visionary. Now how could he after all this neglect the sheltering himself from all these insultings, and making 'em return with confusion upon his Adversaries by saying clearly that all the faithful people in the Church at that time, whether Pastors or others spake no otherwise than he did, and that

his Adversaries were faln into the utmost excess of impudence? But instead of this he has recourse to some passages which he perverts as well as he can to his sense, and to a clause of the Liturgy wherein there is *Corpus Christi*.

Page 866.

*PASCHASUS* furnishes us likewise with another conjecture from the manner in which he explains his sentiments on this subject of the Eucharist. For he keeps as much as he can the Sacramental expressions, endeavouring to accommodate them to his sense, and proceeds sometimes so far that he seems to conserve the substance of Bread; which appears by several passages which I remark'd in my answer to the *Perpetuity*, and which is not necessary to repeat here. Mr. *Arnaud* answers, *That the only conclusion which reason draws from hence is, that these Sacramental expressions do perfectly agree with the Faith of the Real Presence*. But if they do agree 'tis by constraint, and in doing violence to the nature and signification of the terms. When *Paschasus* says for example, *In pane & vino sine ulla decoloratione substantiæ hoc mysterium interius vi & potestate divina peragitur*. What violence must not be offered these terms to accommodate them to the change of the substance of Bread? For to say that the substance of Bread loses not his colour, is an expression which naturally includes this sense, that the substance remains with its colour. What violence must not be offered these other terms. *Caro & Sanguis per Spiritum Sanctum consecratur, aliqui mihi nec caro est nec sanguis est, sed iudicium quod percipio, quia sine donante spiritu nullum male præsumentibus donum ex Deo præstatur*. What violence I say must not be offered them to accommodate 'em to the sense of Transubstantiation? For naturally these terms signifie, that 'tis the Holy Spirit dwelling in the Faithful, which makes the Bread and Wine be to 'em the Flesh and Blood of Jesus Christ, for which reason the Wicked who have not the Holy Spirit do not receive this Flesh and Blood. This language then of constraint shews that *Paschasus* strove still to conserve the common expressions, altho that in effect they were contrary to him, whence we may easily conclude that he was an Innovator.

Book 8 ch. 10.  
Page 867.

Is vit 1 Pasch.

A seventh proof may be taken from the testimonies of *Bellarmin* and *Sirmond* both Jesuits, which I have already mention'd in my Answer to the *Perpetuity*. The one says that *Paschasus* was the first Author that wrote seriously and at large of the truth of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharist, and the other assures us, that he was the first that explain'd the true sentiment of the Catholick Church, in such a manner that he has opened the way to others. The first idea which these words present us with is, that *Paschasus* was the first Author that propos'd the Doctrin of the Real Presence clearly, and in plain and precise terms; for this is what is meant by the *Serio* of *Bellarmin*, and especially the *Explicuit* of *Sirmond*. And 'twill signifie nothing to answer as Mr. *Arnaud* does, that these passages mean only that *Paschasus* was the first who collected into one Book what lay scattered in several of the Fathers Writings, according as *Athanasius* was the first who wrote expressly Treatises on the Trinity, and *S. Cyril* the first who largely wrote of the Incarnation and Unity of persons in our Lord and Saviour, as *S. Augustin* is the first who has largely and seriously treated of Original Sin, and that as *Paschasus* had good success in this labor, and in effect well collected the true sentiments of the Fathers, so he has been follow'd by all that came after him. This answer is an illusion, for 'tis far from completely answering *Sirmond's* words, *Genuinum*, says he, *Ecclesiæ Catholicæ sensum ita primus explicuit*,

*plicuit, ut viam cæteris aperuit, qui de eodem argumento multa postea scripsere.* He means not that *Paschasus* was the first who collected in one Book what lay here and there in the Writings of the Fathers, but that he first explain'd the true sense of the Catholick Church. Before him, according to *Sirmond*, this true sentiment, which is to say, the Doctrin of the Real Presence, for this is what he means, was a confused and hidden matter. *Paschasus* was the first who brought it to light, and he did it in such manner that he opened the way to all that came after him. Till his time this way lay hid, he found it, first entred into it, and by his example moved others to do the same. Now this is the honestest confession imaginable, that *Paschasus* was the first Author of this Doctrin; for in fine this explication of the true sentiment of the Church, and this way, are nothing else but the Real Presence, and he was the first discoverer of it. There cannot be any thing said like this of *S. Athanasius* in respect of the Trinity, nor of *S. Cyril* in respect of the Incarnation, nor of *S. Augustin* in respect of Original Sin. It may be indeed said that they have treated more amply of these matters than what was done before, that they have more firmly grounded them by disengaging them from the objections of Hereticks; but it can never be said they were the first that explain'd the true sentiment of the Catholick Church, for it was explain'd, and distinctly known before them. The Church worship'd before *Athanasius* his time three distinct persons in the Godhead, acknowledged two Natures, and one only person in Jesus Christ before *S. Cyril's* time, and *S. Austin's*, and also believ'd that all the Children of *Adam* came into the world infected with his corruption.

THESE are the seven proofs of *Paschasus* his Innovation, which *Mr. Arnaud* has cited from me, and which he has endeavoured to answer. But, besides these, there are also some others which he has past over in silence, and of which 'twill not be amiss to put him in mind. I draw then an eighth from the testimony of *Berenger*, which makes *Paschasus* precisely as we do, the Author of the Opinion which asserts the real conversion of the substances of Bread and Wine. *Sententia*, says he, *imo vecordia vulgi; Paschasi* Apud Lanfranc. lib. de Corp. & Sang. Dom. *atque Lanfranci minime superesse in altari post consecrationem substantiam panis & vini.* The opinion, or rather folly of the Vulgar, of *Paschasus* and *Lanfranc*, that the substance of Bread and Wine remains not after the Consecration. *Lanfranc* who cites these words, says a little after, that when the Letters of *Berenger* were read at Rome, 'twas known that he exalted *John Scot* and condemned *Paschasus*, *intellecto quod Joannem Scotum extolleret Paschasium damnares.* This moreover appears by *Berenger's* Letter to *Richard*, *injustissime damnatum Scotum Joannem, injustissime nihilo minus assertum Paschasium in Concilio Vercellenfi.* And his Letter to *Ascelin*, *Tu are,* Tom. 2. Spic. in not. ad vitam Lanfranc. ad Luc. D' Alen. says he, *of a contrary opinion to all the laws of Nature, contrary to the Gospel, contrary to the sentiment of the Apostle, if you are of Paschasus his opinion in what he ALONE has fancied or forged in his imagination, that the substance of Bread does no more subsist in the Sacrament of our Lords Body: Sapis contra omnes naturæ rationes, contra Evangelicam & Apostolicam sententiam, si cum Paschasio sapis, in eo quod SOLUS sibi confingit Sacramento Dominici Corporis decedere panis omnino substantiam.* Now on one hand this shews *Mr. Arnaud's* injustice, which attributes to the modern Ministers th' invention of this History which makes *Paschasus* the first Author of the opinion of the Real Presence; and on the other this gives a great presumption that what the Ministers say touching *Paschasus* is true, seeing in the 11th. Century when the Dispute about the Eucharist grew hot, people



ple said the same thing then we do now. We see *Paschasus* in the 9th. Century charg'd with Enthusiasms and Visions; in the 11th. respected as the Father of Transubstantiation, as he that drew it only from his own fancy, these two matters of fact are moreover confirm'd by I know not how many other considerable matters hereunto relating. And Mr. *Arnaud* comes telling us confidently, that he marvels we should dare still attribute this Innovation to *Paschasus*, and that our proofs are mere *sophisms* and conjectures not worth the minding.

*Cellot in ap-  
pend. ad Hist.  
Cottesh.*

THE anonymous Author which *Cellot* the Jesuit has publish'd furnishes us with a 9th. proof in his way of defending *Paschasus*. For having said, *That some assert what we receive from the Altar is the same as that which is born of the Virgin, and that others deny it, and say that 'tis another thing,* he adds a little after. Now for those which say 'tis the same thing as that which was born of the Virgin, or say 'tis another thing, we shall relate the several opinions of the Holy Fathers which do indeed appear to be different, but yet be satisfactory enough were they fully understood with discretion. Now I speak of *Paschasus Ratbert*, Abbot of Corby, who whether he was required, or provoked, for 'tis uncertain which, has wrote on this matter a Book of about an hundred Chapters, which he has fill'd with several Authorities of the Fathers, and under the name of *S. Ambrose* has therein establish'd that what we receive from the Altar is entirely the same Flesh which was born of the Virgin, suffered on the Cross, risen from the Sepulchre, and is at this day offered for the life of the world. *Raban* in his Epistle to the Abbot *Egilon*, and one *Ratram* in a Book dedicated to King *Charles*, argue sufficiently against him, saying, that 'tis not this same Flesh; which they prove by the testimony of *S. Hierom*, which says, that the Body of *Jesus Christ* may be said to be in two manners, and by the Authority of *S. Augustin*, which says, that this term may be taken three ways. And because they maintain that in *S. Ambrose's* Books we do not find it exactly thus, we shall relate not only the passage of *S. Ambrose* without any alteration, but also those of *S. Augustin*, *S. Hierom*, and others in the manner we found 'em, to the end that having considered them it may appear to those to whom it shall please God to reveal it, that these great men did not differ one from another in opinion, and that in the Catholick Church we must all have the same mind without the least Schism. Hitherto we do not find that this defender of *Paschasus* has recourse to the publick Belief of the Church of his time, or protests that *Paschasus* has offered nothing but what all Christians did generally agree to, except some small number of troublesome Disputers, who denied in secret what they dared not contradict in publick, as Mr. *Arnaud* speaks. We find on the contrary that he denotes those which held the Doctrin of *Paschasus* under the name of some, and the opposite party under the name of others. *Dicentibus quibusdam idem esse quod sumitur de altari, quod & illud quod natum est ex Virgine, aliis autem negantibus.* This is not the language of one who was perswaded the whole Church spake like *Paschasus*. But this will still further appear if we consider what this same Author adds afterwards, for having alledged some passages of the Fathers which he believ'd favour'd *Paschasus*, *Hæc ideo*, says he, *posita sunt si forte per ea simplicitas Paschasi Ratberti possit excusari; unde maxime ab obloquentibus Rabano & Ratramno sugillari videtur, quia dixerat eandem esse carnem quæ de Altari sumitur & de virgine generatur, & quæ quotidie adhuc pro mundi salute immolatur.* I have brought these passages to see whether one could not excuse the simplicity of *Paschasus Ratbert*, especially in respect of that particular for which he is blamed by his Adversaries, *Raban*  
and

and Ratram, for saying that what we receive from the Altar is the same Flesh which was born of the Virgin, and is still every day immolated for the salvation of the world. Now let any man seriously tell me, whether people are wont to defend after this manner one who has the whole Church on his side, excepting some *troublesom rash Disputers*? Is such a ones simplicity endeavoured to be excused by any body? Do we say in such a case, *if perhaps it may be excusable*? Do people place on one hand irreconcilable Adversaries who defame him, and on the other simple excuses, and excuses offered in a fearful and doubtful manner, *Si forte simplicitas Paschasii possit excusari*? Let Mr. Arnaud say what he pleases, the discourse of this anonymous Author offers such an idea of the Adversaries of *Paschasus* as of persons that delivered themselves openly in the Church, who had then advantage over *Paschasus*, even to the defaming him for teaching the Real Presence, and furnishes us at the same time with the idea of *Paschasus*, as of a man who must be excused upon the account of his simplicity, but yet his expressions may be defended by some passages of the Fathers. Now these two ideas plainly enough shew that *Paschasus* was an Innovator.

THERE are other proofs in my Answer to the *Perpetuity* which I do not think necessary to repeat here, having nothing more to add to 'em. We will pass then to Authors who were Contemporaries with *Paschasus*, to know of them whether they taught the same Doctrin as he did.

## C H A P. X.

*Of Authors in the Ninth Century, Walafrius, Strabo, Florus,  
Remy of Auxerre, Chstrian Drutmar.*

WE may now say (I hope) with some kind of confidence, notwithstanding Mr. Arnaud's insultings, that *Paschasus* was an Innovator. This is a truth sufficiently clear'd by what I have already done in the two preceding Chapters. But to make this (if possible) more plain, we must make some few reflections on the Authors which were of the same Century as *Paschasus*, besides what I already said of 'em in my Answer to the *Perpetuity*. For if it appears that these Authors have not held the same language as he did; if it appears on the contrary that they have express'd themselves on the Eucharist quite otherwise than he has done; if one party of 'em have formally declared themselves against his Doctrin, I see no reason why any man should still obstinately maintain that *Paschasus* has said or wrote nothing but what the Church of his time believed and taught with him.

FIRST 'tis certain we shall not find the Authors of that Century, altho they were not inconsiderable for their number, and almost all of 'em wrote something on the Eucharist, have delivered themselves on so great a subject in the manner *Paschasus* has done, neither in respect of the sense, nor terms. Let any man shew us for example they have asserted *that the substance of the Bread is converted into the Body of Jesus Christ*, in such a manner that it does not any longer remain, altho the savour and colour still remain;

main, or taught that the substance of the Flesh of Jesus Christ enters into our Body, that what we receive from the Altar is nothing else but the same Flesh which was born of the Virgin, which died and was buried, and that 'tis this Flesh in propriety of nature; or have said that this Flesh of the word *pulule* (this is the expression *Paschasus* uses) which is to say, that it multiplies it self, and that this multiplication is made in the Sacrament, and yet the same Flesh of Jesus Christ, and that yet he remains wholly entire. Let any one shew us any thing like this in these Authors. Mr. *Arnaud* ought to have employed himself in this, instead of expatiating as he has done upon vain arguments. Twenty whole Chapters will not so well satisfy rational persons, as twelve clear passages out of Authors of the 9th. Century, did they contain the same Doctrin which *Paschasus* has set down in his Writings; for this would shew the conformity there was between him and his Contemporaries, and at the same time discharge him from the accusation of novelty, which we lay against him. But there is no danger of Mr. *Arnaud's* taking upon him this task, because he knows 'tis impossible to acquit himself well of it.

Answer to the  
second Treatise,  
part 3.  
ch. 2.

IN the second place 'tis certain these Authors have not only not spoke of the Eucharist as *Paschasus* has done, but on the contrary, have spoke of it in a very different manner from his: whence we may easily collect that his Doctrin agreed in no sort with theirs. I shall begin with *Walafridus Strabo*, whose words may be seen more at length in my answer to the *Perpetuity*. We shall find him thus speaking, *That Jesus Christ has establish'd the Sacraments of his Body and Blood in the substance of Bread and Wine. That our Saviour has chosen the Bread and Wine, to wit, the same species which Melchisedec offered, to be the mystery of his Body and Blood: That instead of this great diversity of Sacrifices which were in use under the Law, the Faithful must be contented with the simple Oblation of Bread and Wine.* Mr. *Arnaud* may talk as long as he pleases, that these are expressions which do naturally link themselves with the belief of the Real Presence. Which is what we deny him. These expressions do naturally signify nothing else, but that the Sacrament is real Bread and real Wine, and if any use these kind of expressions in the Church of Rome, they do it merely by constraint to accommodate themselves in some sort to the expressions of the Ancients. Mr. *Arnaud* again tells us that *Walafridus* says, *That the mysteries be really the Body and Blood of our Lord.* But we have already several times told him that *Walafridus* explains himself in the same place, and refers this really to the virtue, not the substance of Christs Body, which also appears from the title of his Chapter, which is, *De virtute Sacramentorum.*

*Florus magister*  
in *Exposit.*  
*Missæ.*

*FLORUS*, an Author of the same Century, who has wrote a kind of Commentary on the Liturgy, says, *That the Oblation altho taken from the simple fruits of the Earth is made to the Faithful, fidelibus, the Body and Blood of the only Son of God.* After which, borrowing the words of *S. Augustin*, he says, *That the Consecration makes us this Body and this mystical Blood.* And the better to explicate what he means by this Body and this mystical Blood, he adds, *That the Creature of Bread is made the Sacrament of the Flesh and Blood of Jesus Christ, that 'tis eaten sacramentally, that it remains wholly entire in Heaven, and is so in our hearts.* And again a little further, *Whatsoever is done in this Oblation of the Body and Blood of our Lord is a mystery. We see therein one thing, and understand another; what we see has a corporal species, what we understand has a spiritual fruit.* What he



he says of this mystical Body and Blood which he explains afterwards by the *Sacrament* of the Flesh and Blood of Jesus Christ, in referring to this alone the effect of the Consecration sufficiently denotes he had not in his view either change of substance, or any Real Presence. The opposition likewise which he makes of Jesus Christ eaten in *parts in the Sacrament*, to himself who remains entire in Heaven, and who enters entire into our hearts does no less denote it; for to what purpose is this distinction? If our Saviour Christ be really in the Sacrament, is he not eaten entire in the same manner in our hearts, and wholly entire in Heaven? The former words, that whatsoever is done in the Eucharist is *a mystery wherein we see one thing, and understand another*, testify the same thing; for what is this *thing* which we see, but the Bread and Wine, and what is this *other* which we understand but the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, which are the object of our understanding? He explains himself immediately afterwards, *The mystery, says he, of our Redemption was Wine, according to what our Saviour himself says. I will drink no more of this fruit of the Vine. And again, Our Lord recommends to us this mystery, saying, Do this in remembrance of me, which the Apostle explaining, says, As often as yee eat of this Bread, and drink of this Cup, yee shew forth the Lords Death till he comes: The Oblation then of this Bread, and this Cup is the Commemoration, and annunciation of the Death of Jesus Christ.* That which is most considerable is his making this Commentary on the very words of the Consecration, without adjoyning a word either of the conversion of substances, or substantial Presence of the Body and Blood of our Lord.

Mr. ARNAUD, who oft loses his time in vain contests, leaves all these principal passages which I come now from relating, and sets himself only against the translation of these words, *Oblatio quamvis de simplicibus terræ frugibus sumpta, divinæ benedictionis ineffabili potentia efficitur fidelibus Corpus & Sanguis.* I said that this *fidelibus* must be rendred, *to the Faithful*, and not *for the Faithful*; and for this I alledged some reasons. *This is a thing, says Mr. Arnaud, which I could willingly grant him, did he ask it with a better meen: for either translation is indifferent to me. But seeing he's resolv'd to carry it away by force, I think I'm oblig'd to tell him that he is unjust.* So that here Mr. Arnaud has a quarrel with me for my carriage.

*Si natura negat facit indignatio versum.*

Truly I'm sorry I cannot make my self agreeable to him, I do what I can, as much as reason and truth will permit; but there are some persons so unhappy that they cannot give content do what they can.

I am to Mr. Arnaud, what *Sabidus* was to *Martial*. I cannot help it. But had he been pleased to take his eyes off my person, and considered the reason, he had seen, that these two translations are not in effect indifferent, because that which says, *for the Faithful*, seems simply to denote that the Eucharist is naturally design'd for the use of the Faithful, and not for that of the wicked; whereas the other denotes that 'tis the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, only to the Faithful, and not to the wicked; which is wholly different. Secondly. That that which says, *to the Faithful*, is more conformable to the Rules of Grammar, according to which commonly, *fidelibus* signifies, *to the Faithful*, and *pro fidelibus*, *for the Faithful*. Thirdly, That the sequel of *Florus* his discourse denotes his sense to be that the Eu-

G g g g

charist

charist is not the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, but only to the Faithful, because he immediately adds, that as we eat Jesus Christ by pieces in the Sacrament, he is *wholly entire in our heart*, which can only respect the Faithful to the exclusion of the wicked; and because he says, that we see in the Sacrament one thing, and *understand by it another which has a spiritual fruit*, which moreover appertains only to the Faithful. What he alledges from Remy of Auxerre, who explains this clause, *Ut nobis Corpus & Sanguis fiat dilectissimi filii tui*, by these words, *id est ad nostram salutem fiat Corpus & Sanguis*, is invalid, because we may tell him, that had Florus design'd to say the same thing as Remus, he would have explain'd himself like to Remus; which he has not done; besides that the explication of Remus is not contrary to that of Florus: for it does not follow from the Sacraments being made the Body of Jesus Christ for our Salvation, that it be made his Body and Blood to the Wicked. All the difference there is between these two Expositions is, that that of Florus is more clear and express than the other. We can conclude very clearly from that of Florus that the Eucharist is the Body of Jesus Christ only to the Faithful, but not to the wicked, but one cannot draw this consequence from that of Remus, neither can one draw a contrary one.

Book 8. ch. 7.  
p. 822.

THIS conclusion which I draw from the passage of Florus offends Mr. Arnaud; By the like argument, says he, he will prove that Paschasius did not believe the Real Presence, for this Author says as well as Florus that Jesus Christ grants us by his grace, that the Eucharist be to us his Body and Blood. He will prove, adds he, That all the Catholick Priests do no more believe Transubstantiation, seeing they say this Prayer, in the Canon of the Mass. *Quam Oblationem tu Deus in omnibus quæsumus adscriptam, ratam, rationabilem, acceptabilemque: facere digneris, ut nobis Corpus & Sanguis fiat dilectissimi tui filii Domini nostri Jesu Christi*. I answer there is a great deal of difference between Florus and Paschasius. Paschasius formally teaches the Doctrin of the Real Presence and conversion of substances. Florus does not do any thing like this. When then we judg of Florus his expression, reason requires us to judg of it according to the sense which it naturally has; but when we judg of that of Paschasius, we must judg of it according to the forced and violent sense which is given to this expression to make it agree with Transubstantiation, and the Real Presence, because it appears to us elsewhere that Paschasius believed these Doctrins. When Paschasius speaks of what the Wicked receive in the Eucharist, he speaks of it in a manner so intricate and confused, that it visibly appears he affects to be obscure. Explaining these words, *He that eats my Flesh, and drinks my Blood dwells in me and I in him*, he introduces our Saviour saying, *If he does not first dwell in me and I in him, he cannot eat my Flesh nor drink my Blood. And what then is it which men do eat: Do not all indifferently take the Sacraments of the Altar? They take 'em without doubt, but one eats spiritually the Flesh of Jesus Christ, and drinks his Blood, and the other not, altho he seems to take the morsel from the Priests hand. And what does he then receive, there being but one Consecration, if he does not receive the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ? Truly because the Wicked receive unworthily, they eat and drink their own damnation, according to the saying of the Apostle; for they do not try themselves before they come, nor discern the Lords Body. And this is what the Wicked eat and drink. They do not profitably receive the Flesh and Blood, but their own damnation*. This plainly appears to be the discourse of a man that hides himself, and durst not say openly the wicked receive the Body and

Lib. de Corp.  
& Sang. Dom.  
cap. 6.

and Blood of Jesus Christ, and seems to insinuate the contrary; but yet still contains himself within these terms of *spiritually* and *profitably* that he may save himself by distinctions. *Paschasus* then is not to be offered as an instance. As to what *Mr. Arnaud* alledges out of the Canon of the Mass, I acknowledg it cannot be concluded thence that the Priests of the Roman Church in our times do not believe Transubstantiation, because as I have already said; it clearly appearing elsewhere that they believe it, we must not judge of the terms of the Canon according to their natural sense. But a man may conclude thence that those who at first made this Liturgy, had not the same belief with those at this day; for they spake then naturally, and according to the common belief of their Church. Now it is certain that on the Principle of Transubstantiation one must desire of God not that the Bread be made to us the Body of his Son, but that it be made the Body of his Son absolutely. There is a great deal of difference between these two; for if the Bread be transubstantiated *it is made* the Body of Jesus Christ in it self, to all respects, and beyond all respects; but if it be only *made to us* the Body of Jesus Christ, it is made so only in our respect, which is to say that 'tis to us instead of the Body of Jesus Christ, and communicates the virtue and efficacy of it. 'Tis in this sense that the Faithful say in the 84. Psalm, *That God is to 'em a Sun and a Shield*. And *David* in the 119. Psalm, *That the Statutes of God have been to him as so many musical songs*. And in the 41. Psalm, according to the vulgar Translation, *Fuerunt mihi lachrymæ panis die ac nocte*. This way of speaking is very usual amongst the Latins, as appears by these examples of *Virgil*, *Erit ista mihi genetrix, eris mihi magnus Apollo, erit ille mihi semper Deus, Mens sua cuique Deus, Dextra mihi Deus*. And so far concerning *Florus*.

WE must now pass on to *Remy of Auxerre*, to whom as *Mr. Arnaud* Book 8. ch. 7. page 24. says, is attributed not only the Exposition of the Mass which goes under his name, but also the Commentary of *S. Paul*, which others refer to *Haymus Bishop of Alberstat*. They that will take the pains to examin the Doctrine of this Author, not in the declamations of *Mr. Arnaud*, but in the passages themselves, wherein 'tis found explain'd, will soon find that he held the Opinion of *Damascen* and the Greeks, which is the union of the Bread with the Divinity, and by the Divinity to the natural Body of Jesus Christ, and that by means of this union, or conjunction, the Bread becomes the Body of Jesus Christ, and is made one and the same Body with him. Which does manifestly appear by what I have related of it in my Answer to the *Perpetuity*. *The Flesh*, says he, *which the Word has taken in the Womb of the Virgin in unity of person, and the Bread which is consecrated in the Church, are the same Body of Christ*. For as this *Flesh* is the Body of Christ, so this Bread passes to the Body of Christ, and these are not two Bodies, but one Body. For the fulness of the Divinity which was in that Body, fills likewise this Bread, and the same Divinity of the Word which is in them, fills the Body of Christ which is consecrated by the Ministry of several Priests throughout the whole world, and makes it one only Body of Christ. He does not say as *Paschasus*, that 'tis entirely the same *Flesh* born of the Virgin, dead and risen, nor that 'tis the same *Flesh*, because it pulses, or multiplies: But he makes of this *Flesh*, and Bread, the same Body by an unity of union; because that the same Divinity which fills the *Flesh*, fills likewise this Bread. And elsewhere, *Altho this Bread be broken in pieces, and Consecrated all over the world, yet the Divinity which fills all things, fills it also, and makes it become one only Body of Christ*. Comment. in 1 Cor. 10. Ibid. in c. 11. It lying upon him to give a reason why several parts of the



In Exposit.  
Can.

same Bread, and several loaves consecrated in divers places were only one Body of Jesus Christ, there was nothing more easie than to say on the hypothesis of Transubstantiation that 'twas one and the same numerical substance, existing wholly entire under the species in each part, and on every Altar where the Consecration is perform'd. But instead of this he falls upon enquiries into the reason of this unity in the Divinity which fills both all the Loaves of the Altars, and all the parts of a Loaf. Again in another place, *As the Divinity of the Word which fills the whole world is one, so altho this Body be Consecrated in several places, and at infinitely different times, yet is not this several Bodies, nor several Bloods, but one only Body, and one only Blood, with that which he took from the Virgin, and which he gave to the Apostles. For the Divinity fills it, and JOINS it to it self, AND MAKES THAT AS IT IS ONE, SO IT BE JOIN'D TO THE BODY OF CHRIST, and is one only Body of Christ in truth.* To say still after this that the Doctrin of Remy is not that this Bread is one with the natural Body of Jesus Christ, because 'tis joyn'd with it, and that 'tis joyn'd with it, because one and the same Divinity fills them, this is methinks for a man to wilfully blind himself, seeing Remus says it in so many words. He teaches the same thing a little further in another place, *As the Flesh of Jesus Christ which he took of the Virgin is his true Body which was put to death for our Salvation, so the Bread which Jesus Christ gave to his Disciples, and to all the Elest, and which the Priests Consecrate every day in the Church, with the virtue of the Divinity which fills it, is the true Body of Jesus Christ; and this Flesh which he has taken, and this Bread are not two Bodies, but make but one only Body of Christ.* We may find the same Doctrin in his Commentaries on the 10th. Chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews. *This Host, says he, speaking of the Eucharist, is one and not many, as were the ancient ones. But how is it one and not many, seeing 'tis offered both by several persons, and in several places, and at several times.* A person that had the hypothesis of Transubstantiation in his mind, would not have stuck to say, that it is in all places and at all times one and the same numerical substance, the same Body which pullutes, or multiplies it self, as Paschasus speaks. Whereas Remy betakes himself to another course without mentioning a word, either of this unity of substance, or this pullulation. *We must, says he, carefully remark that 'tis the Divinity of the Word, which being one, filling all things, and being every where, canes these to be not several Sacrifices, but one, altho it be offered by many; and is one only Body of Christ with that which he took of the Virgin, and not several Bodies.*

cap. 40.

IT cannot be denied but this Opinion of the unity of the Bread with the Body of Jesus Christ by way of conjunction, and by means of the Divinity which fills the one and the other, got some footing in the Latin Church, even since Damascen's time. We find it in the Book of Divine Offices falsly attributed to Alcuinus, almost in the same terms wherein we have seen it in Remus; so that it seems that one of these Authors only copied out from the other. *As the Divinity of the Word, says this supposed Alcuinus, is one, who fills the whole world, so, altho this Body be Consecrated in several places, and at an infinite number of times, yet are not these several Bodies of Christ, nor several Cups, but one only Body of Christ, and one only Blood with that which he took of the Virgin, and which he gave to his Apostles. For the Divinity of the Word fills him who is everywhere (which is to say, that which is Consecrated in several places) and makes, that as it is one, it be also joyn'd to the Body of Christ, and that it be but one only Body in truth.* WE

WE find this same opinion in another Book of Divine Offices, which some attribute to *Rupert*, and others to *Walramus*, *This Body which is taken from the Altar, and that which is taken from the Virgin, are not said to be, nor indeed are, two Bodies, because one and the same Word is on high in the Flesh, and here below in the Bread.* Rupert lib. 2. de Divin. Off. cap. 2.

IT is likewise very likely, that in the 11th. Century during the greatest heats of the Dispute of *Lanfranc* against *Berenger*, there were several adversaries of *Berenger* who followed this Opinion. Which may be manifestly collected from an argument which *Lanfranc* attributes to the *Berengarians* in these terms: *If the Bread be changed into the true Flesh of Jesus Christ, either the Bread must be carried to Heaven to be changed there into the Flesh of Christ, or the Flesh of Jesus Christ must descend on the Earth, to the end that the Bread may be changed into it. Now neither of these is done.* Lanfran. de Corp. & sang. Dom. This Argument necessarily supposes that the *Berengarians* did set themselves against persons, who thought the Bread was changed into the Body of Jesus Christ by way of union and conjunction, or as speaks *Damascen*, by way of addition, as the food is changed into our body. On this Hypothesis they had some reason to say, that either the Body which is above must come down here below, or that the Bread which is here below must be carried above; for it does not seem immediately that the conjunction can be well made otherwise: But they could not have the least reason, or likelihood of reason to form this objection against the Doctrine of Transubstantiation in the manner wherein the Church of *Rome* understands it. For if the substance of Bread be converted into the same numerical substance of the Body of Jesus Christ which is in Heaven, the distance, or proximity of this Bread, and of this Body, make not this conversion, either more easie, or more difficult. Tho the Bread here below be carried up into Heaven, tho the Body of Jesus Christ which is above in Heaven descends here below on Earth, this contributes nothing to the making of the one to be converted into the other. For the conversion of one substance into another, speaks quite another thing than a kind of local motion, as is that of ascending or descending. It is then evident that the opinion which the *Berengarians* opposed was that the Bread is made the Body of Jesus Christ by way of union.

WE may moreover justify the same thing by a passage of *Ascelinus*, one of *Berenger's* adversaries; for observe here in what manner he explains his sentiment in his Letter to *Berenger* himself, *Neque vero mirari, vel diffidere debemus Deum facere posse ut hoc quod in Altari consecratur virtute Spiritus Sancti, & ministerio Sacerdotis, uniatur corpori illi quod ex Maria Virgine redemptor noster assumpsit, quippe utrumque substantia corporea, utrumque visibile, si reminiscimur nos ipsos ex corporea, & incorporea, ex mortali, & immortali substantia esse compactos, si denique firmiter credimus divinam humanamque naturam convenisse personam.* In notis d. Acheri in vitam Lanfr. 'Tis neither a matter of admiration, nor of doubt for God to make that which is consecrated on the Altar by virtue of the Holy Spirit, and ministry of the Priest to be UNITED TO THIS BODY which our Redeemer took of the Virgin. Both one and the other being a corporeal substance, both one and the other visible, if we consider that we our selves are composed of a corporeal substance, and of another that is incorporeal, of a mortal substance, and of another that is incorporeal, of a mortal substance, and of another that is incorporeal; and if in fine we firmly believe that the two natures, the Divine and Humane, are joyn'd together in unity of person.

IT

IT is necessary to relate these passages to shew the Readers how greatly Mr. *Arnaud* deceives them when he would persuade 'em that this opinion of the conjunction of the Bread with the Body of Jesus Christ, by means of the same Divinity which fills them, is a chimera of the Ministers invention. It appears on the contrary that 'tis a sentiment which has been in effect held by divers Authors in the Latin Church, not to mention here that 'tis the Doctrin of *Damascen* and the Greeks which have followed him. And this is the first conclusion which can be drawn hence; but from hence also follow several other most important matters. For first, by this we see that the sentiment of *Paschasus* was not that of the Church of his time, as some would persuade us, seeing those very Authors which Mr. *Arnaud* alledges in his favour, and who seem to come the nearest to *Paschasus* his expressions, are at bottom, and in effect infinitely distant from his Doctrin. Secondly, Hence it appears there was nothing regular in the Latin Church touching Transubstantiation, neither in the 11th. nor 12th. Century, seeing considerable Authors then publickly explain'd their belief concerning the Eucharist in a manner which suffers the Bread and Wine to subsist in their first substance. In the third place, from hence is apparent how little certainty and confidence a rational man can put in the principle of the Author of the *Perpetuity* and Mr. *Arnaud*, who suppose it as a thing certain, that in the time when *Berenger* was first condemned, that is to say in the year 1053. the whole Latin Church was united in the Faith of the Real Presence, and Transubstantiation, seeing the contrary may be justifi'd, as well by the argument which *Lanfranc* relates of the *Berengarians*, as by the passage of *Ascelinus*. In fine, it may be seen here how frivolous and vain Mr. *Arnaud's* negative arguments be, who would prove that the Greeks believ'd in the 11th. Century Transubstantiation, because they did not take *Berengarius* his part, nor disputed on this Article against the Latins. For if Transubstantiation was not then determin'd in the Latin Church, if one might therein make a free profession to believe the union of the Bread with the Body of Jesus Christ, by means of the Divinity, as appears from the example of *Ascelinus*, *Berenger's* great Adversary, what reason could the Greeks have to dispute and make oppositions?

Book 8. ch. 7.  
p. 828.

IT signifies nothing for Mr. *Arnaud* to raise objections against the sentiments of these Authors whom I last mention'd; and to say, *that if the habitation of the Divinity in the Body of Jesus Christ remaining in Heaven, and in the Bread remaining on Earth, and conserving its nature, and the application of this Bread to serve for an instrument to communicate the graces merited by the Body of Jesus Christ, rendered the Bread the Body of Jesus Christ; the same habitation of the Divinity in the Water of Baptism, and the use which God makes of it to communicate his graces, would render it likewise the Body of Jesus Christ, and give occasion to say, that altho there be different Waters to Baptize in, yet these Waters make but one and the same Body of Jesus Christ, that they are changed into the Body of Jesus Christ, that they pass into the Body of Jesus Christ, that altho they appear to be Water, yet in truth they are the Body of Jesus Christ.* Besides that it does not follow that Authors have not had a sentiment, that one may form objections to the contrary, there being no opinion so clear against which we may not raise difficulties. One may moreover answer him from the part of *Remy* and others, that the habitation of the Divinity does not always produce this effect in all the material things which it makes use of whereby to communicate the graces



graces merited by the Body of Jesus Christ, to unite them to the Body of Jesus Christ, and to make them become this Body by way of conjunction and addition. 'Tis an habitation and a particular union of the Divinity to the Bread of the Eucharist which produces in it alone this effect, which must not be extended to other things which Jesus Christ did not say were *his Body*, as he said of the Bread. All that can be hence concluded then is that according to these Authôrs there must be some difference allowed between the habitation of the Divinity in the Bread, and the habitation of this same Divinity in other things, as there is between the habitation of the Divinity in the Faithful and Saints; and the habitation of this same Divinity in the human nature of Jesus Christ, seeing this difference appears in the difference of the effects which they produce. Now this is a thing which these Authors would gladly allow. One may say the same thing touching the Soul and Body of Jesus Christ, which are filled with the same virtue of the Divinity, and yet of which it cannot be said that one is the other. For altho the same Divinity dwells in the Body, and Soul of Jesus Christ, yet this is another kind of habitation, design'd to produce not the above-mention'd effect, but another. The Divinity dwells in all things, and fills them with its virtue, but in a different manner, and this difference discovers it self only by the difference of the effects which it produces in the things themselves.

THIS is near what these Authors would have answer'd had any body offered them these objections. But I am persuaded they would never have approved of this new Philosophy, by which Mr. *Arnaud* endeavours to accommodate their expressions to the sense of the Roman Transubstantiation. *Remy*, says he, *tells us that the Divinity which is in the Body of Jesus Christ, p. 832.* and in the Bread joyns them together, but not by a simple habitation; for it would thus joyn all the creatures where it resides, but by a true operation which renders them not distant, but immediately united. And this union does not determin it self to a simple conjunction, but makes that the Bread passes into the Body of Jesus Christ, that it becomes the Body of Jesus Christ, as wax becomes fire, according to the comparison of *S. Chrysostom*, and as the Bread eaten by Jesus Christ became the Body of Jesus Christ, according to the comparison of other Fathers. This union then is only the way to Transubstantiation. *Remy* and other Authors who have followed this opinion, explain the manner how the Bread is the Body of Jesus Christ, and they say that 'tis inasmuch as 'tis joyn'd to this Body. 'Tis, says *Remy*, one only Body and Blood with that which he took of the Virgin, for the Divinity fills it, and joyns it to it self, and makes that as it is one, so it must be joyn'd to the Body of Jesus Christ, and be one Body of Jesus Christ in truth. The Divinity of the Word (says the pretended *Alcuinus*) fills this Body which is everywhere, (which is to say, that which is Consecrated in an infinite of places) adding it to self, and makes that as it is one, it be also joyn'd to the Body of Jesus Christ, and be one only Body in truth. These words do not put us upon imagining they thought of laying open a certain way to Transubstantiation, nor a preambulatory or preparative union to the conversion, as Mr. *Arnaud* would have us believe. This is a mere illusion. 'Tis clear they teach in what manner the Bread is the same Body with that which he took of the Virgin, and settle here, to wit, inasmuch as 'tis joyn'd to it by the link of the same Divinity, which fills both the one and the other. Which is what appears from the bare reading of their passages, and especially that of *Ascelinus*. *Berenger* had told him, that if he follow'd the opinion of *Paschasius*, he went contrary

trary to all the laws of nature. And *Ascelinus* answers him, *that 'tis neither a subject of admiration, nor a subject of doubt that God can make that which is consecrated on the Altar to be united to this Body which our Saviour took of the Virgin*; which shews he made the ground of his sentiment to consist in this union; and that he respected it not as a way to Transubstantiation, but as that which formally made the Bread the Body of Jesus Christ. The examples which he adds of the Soul and Body which are joyned together, and of the two natures united in Jesus Christ confirm the same thing; for the union of the soul and body, and the union of the two natures are not in any wise ways, and preparations to any Transubstantiation; they are on the contrary unions, wherein the two things united subsist, and on which the mind settles. What Mr. *Arnaud* says, that this union does not terminate it self to a simple conjunction; but makes the Bread pass into the Body of Jesus Christ, is equivocal. For if he means that the formal effect of this union is, that the Bread remaining what it was, becomes the Body of Jesus Christ, we will grant him, that this was in effect the sentiment of these Authors; but if he'll have the Bread, ceasing to be what it was, to become really the same numerical substance which was the Body of Christ before this change, we deny that these Authors have taken it in this sort. The comparisons which he alledges of Wax which becomes Fire, and Bread eaten by Christ which became his Body do contradict this last sense; for the Wax devoured by the Fire becomes not the same substance of Fire in number that it was before; and the Bread which our Saviour eat became not likewise so properly the same substance in number, which was before his Body. So what he says afterwards, *That to joyn the Bread to the Body of Jesus Christ, and to make it to be the Body of Jesus Christ, and pass into the Body of Jesus Christ, signifies to transubstantiate in all the languages of the world*, is a matter ill offered and evidently unjustifiable. For if the Bread becomes the Body of Jesus Christ formally by reason of the union, as the sense of these Authors is, in the same manner as the food we receive becomes our body by the union which it has with it, it is made the Body of Jesus Christ, not by any real conversion into this same substance of the Body of Jesus Christ which was before, but it becomes it by way of addition to this substance, or according to the precise explication which *Damascen* gives of it by way of augmentation and growth of the natural Body of Jesus Christ, as we have already seen in the third Book, when we treated of the opinion of the Greeks.

p. 342.

Page 832.  
Book 8. ch. 7.

THIS being thus clear'd up, 'tis no hard matter to answer the passages of *Remy*, which Mr. *Arnaud* alledges with so great confidence, *Seeing that a mystery, says he, is that which signifies another thing, if it be the Body of Jesus Christ in truth, why call we it a mystery, 'Tis because that after the Consecration it is one thing, and it appears another. It appears to be Bread and Wine, but 'tis in truth the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ. For God accommodating himself to our weakness, seeing we are not used to eat raw Flesh, and drink Blood, makes these gifts remain in their first form, altho they be in truth the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ.* I answer that *Remy* means that the gifts appear to be after the Consecration what they were before; to wit, simple Bread and Wine, that the change which they have received, being become the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, by their union with the natural Body, is an invisible thing, and that this union does not change any thing of their first form, altho it seems it should do it seeing the Bread which our Saviour eat, and which became likewise his Body by union, took the form

form of Flesh. That God deals otherwise in the Eucharist by way of condescension to our weakness, because we cannot suffer this form of Flesh, but yet the union ceases not to be true, and consequently the Bread is in truth the Body of Jesus Christ, altho it does not appear to be so. This is the true sense of *Remy* grounded on his own Hypothesis, and not that which *Mr. Arnaud* imputes to him.

THE second passage as *Mr. Arnaud* alledges it, is conceived in these terms, *As the Divinity of the Word is one which fills all the world, so altho the Body be consecrated in several places, and at infinitely different times, yet this is not several Bodies of Jesus Christ, nor several Cups, but the same Body and the same Blood, with that which he took in the Virgins Womb; and which he gave to his Apostles. And therefore we must observe that whether we take more, or less, all do equally receive the Body of Jesus Christ entire.* But first I demand of *Mr. Arnaud* who gave him that liberty to retrench from this passage a whole sentence, to alledg what goes before, and what follows, and leave out a whole period in the middle, without any other reason than that it solves the difficulty, and clearly shews *Remy's* sense? Is it fairly done in these kind of disputes to maim passages of Authors which do not make for us? Moreover were it some words either before or after, we might perhaps suppose in his favour, that 'twere only an omission, or neglect, and that he did not mind that what he left out belonged to the same passage, but to retrench a whole sentence from the middle of a discourse, is I think a thing without example. Here then is what *Remy* says, *'Tis one and the same Body, and the same Blood with that which he took in the Womb of the Virgin, and which he gave to his Apostles. FOR THE DIVINITY FILLS IT, AND JOINS IT TO IT SELF, AND MAKES, THAT AS IT IS ONE, IT BE LIKEWISE JOIN'D TO THE BODY OF JESUS CHRIST, AND THAT IT BE ONE ONLY BODY IN THE TRUTH.* This period eclips'd leaves all the rest of the passage favourable to *Mr. Arnaud*, and therefore he has thought fitting to lay it aside according to the liberty which he allows himself of removing whatsoever offends him; but this same period re-establish'd shews clearly the sense of *Remy*, which is, that all the Loaves consecrated in several places are one and the same Body of Jesus Christ with that which he took of the Virgin, not because they are transubstantiated into it, but because they are join'd with it by means of the Divinity which is one in all these Loaves.

THE third passage has these words, *That as the Flesh which Jesus Christ has taken in the Womb of the Virgin, is his true Body crucified for our salvation, so this Bread which Jesus Christ has given to his Disciples and to all those which are predestinated to eternal life, and which the Priests consecrate every day in the Church, WITH THE VIRTUE OF THE DIVINITY WHICH FILLS THIS BREAD, is the true Body of Jesus Christ. And this Flesh which he has taken, and this Bread are not two Bodies, but make one only true Body of Jesus Christ, so that when this Bread is broken and eaten, Jesus Christ is sacrificed and eaten, and yet remains entire and living. And as this Body which he depos'd on the Cross was offer'd for our Redemption, so this Bread is offer'd every day to God for our Salvation and Redemption, which altho it appears to be Bread, is yet the Body of Christ. For our Redeemer having regard to our weakness, and seeing us subject to sin, has given us this Sacrament, to the end that being now incapable of dying, altho we sin every day, we may have a true Sacrifice by which our iniquities may*



be expiated. And because all these Loaves make but one Body of Jesus Christ and are offered for our Redemption, he has said, *This is my Body which shall be given for you, and added, do this, which is to say, Consecrate this Body, in remembrance of me, to wit, of my Passion, and your Redemption, for I have redeemed you by my Blood.* Our Lord leaving this blessed Sacrament to all his faithful servants to engrave it in their hearts and memories has done like a man who drawing near the time of his death, sends to his friends a great present for a remembrance of him, saying, *Receive this gift, my dear friend, and keep it carefully for my sake, to the end that every time you see it, you may think on me.* There is nothing in all this but what may very well agree with the Hypothesis of Remy, that the Bread is the Body of Jesus Christ by way of union and conjunction with the natural Body. This Bread with the virtue of the Divinity which fills it, is the true Body of Jesus Christ, because an addition made to the natural Body becomes the true Body. And these are not two Bodies but one only Body, because that according to the argument of Damascen an augmentation or a growth of a Body does not make another, but the same Body. When this Bread is broken and eaten, Jesus Christ is immolated and eaten, to wit, in this Bread which is joyn'd to him, and yet he remains entire and living, to wit, in his natural Body. This Bread is offered for our Redemption, inasmuch as 'tis a commemoration of it, and an application made to us of the price of our Redemption on the Cross. And in this sense 'tis a true Sacrifice which expiates us because it does represent and apply to us the true Sacrifice of the Cross of Jesus Christ, as Remy thereupon formally explains himself in these words, *Do this, that is to say, Consecrate this Body in remembrance of me, to wit, of my Passion and your Redemption, for I have redeemed you by my Blood.* Here are the objections which Mr. Arnaud has made on Remy, let any one judge whether he has had reason to make such a bustle with this Author and say, *That it appears strange any man should question the sentiment of an Author which speaks in this sort. For in fine, a body would think the license of contradicting every thing should have its bounds.* 'Twere well if Mr. Arnaud would accustom himself to judge of things with less prejudice.

WE must now pass on to Christian Drutmar, of whom I had alledged a very considerable passage taken from his Commentary on the 26. Chapter of S. Matthew, that is to say, from an explication which he makes precisely of th' institution of the Holy Sacrament. The Author of the *Perpetuity* had cavil'd on this passage as much as 'tis possible, sometimes saying that the translation which I made of it was not faithful, sometimes that the Text it self was corrupted, sometimes that the words of which it consists had no coherence, sometimes that the passage was question'd by Sixtus of Sienne, and that there was a Manuscript of Drutmar in the Convent of Grey-Friers at Lyons which instead of this explication, *Hoc est Corpus meum. Id est in Sacramento*, contain'd these words, *Hoc est Corpus meum. Hoc est in Sacramento vere subsistens*, And I know not how many other frivolous evasions which may be seen fully refuted in my answer to the *Perpetuity*. Mr. Arnaud did not think it necessary again to engage himself in this dispute. He only tells us that 'tis the direct attention to the Sacrament, and external vail which makes Drutmar to explain these words; *Hoc est Corpus meum*, by these, *id est in Sacramento*. For when a man directs his mind to the Sacrament, and that which strikes our senses, one cannot say strictly that 'tis the Body it self of Jesus Christ. It is apparent Bread, 'tis the sign, the similitude, the Sacrament of this Body which is the Body of Jesus Christ only in Sacrament, as Drutmar says,

Answer to the  
second Treatise,  
part 3.  
ch. 2.

Book 8. ch. 4.  
p. 797.

*says. This is not the point in question. But the question is to know in what sort the people of those days believed the Body of Jesus Christ was joyn'd to this Sacrament and Vail. 'Tis by this we must supply Drutmar's expression; for nothing can be more unjust than to judg of his sentiment by a word which he spake cursorily, and by an abridged expression.*

IT must be acknowledg'd no easie matter to found the bottom of these Gentlemens minds; who ever could imagin that after so many attempts to elude the passage of *Drutmar*, *Mr. Arnaud* finding his labour in vain should betake himself to the *direction of attention*? *Drutmar* writes an express Commentary on the institution of the Eucharist. He explains these words of our Saviour, *This is my Body*, in this sense, *that is to say Sacramentally*. And *Mr. Arnaud* comes and tells us by his own Authority *that he minded directly only the vail and appearances of Bread which cover the Body of Christ*; as if *Drutmar* did not design to give the true sense of our Saviour in the explication of these words, or as if our Saviour meant only by these words that the appearances of Bread signifie his Body; or as if a Commentator were not obliged to direct his attention to the principal, natural and essential sense of the words he explains, without falling into forein and fantastical senses which no body could imagin but himself. For I do not believe it has ever yet entred into any man's thoughts that these terms, *This is my Body*, signifie, *that the accidents of Bread, or the vail of the appearances of Bread which cover the Body of Jesus Christ are this Body only in sign and Sacrament*. Neither must *Mr. Arnaud* tell us that this is a word which *Drutmar* spake transiently and for brevity sake; for 'tis an express and formal explication of our Saviours words. Supposing people commonly believed Transubstantiation and the Real Presence, as *Mr. Arnaud* would have it, what likelihood is there that in an age wherein people could not be ignorant, that this Doctrin met with much contradiction in the person of *Paschasus*, that *Drutmar* (who was a Religious of the Convent of *Corbie*, which is to say of the same Convent as *Paschasus* was Abbot of) would deceive the world, betray the publick Faith of the Church, favour those that opposed it, scandalize his own proper party, and give way to an heretical explication of Christs words, and this by the rule of *direct attention*, and by the means of *abbreviated expressions*. In truth *Mr. Arnaud* shews what kind of opinion he has of us, when he supposes such kind of answers as these will satisfie us.

## C H A P. XI.

Of other Authors in the Ninth Century, Amalarius, Heribald, Raban, Bertram, and John Scot.

Perpetuity of  
the Faith,  
page 83.

Book 8 ch. 11.  
Page 870.

**A**FTER Drutmar, we must examin Amalarius. If we believe what Andrew du Val the Sorbonist Doctor says of him in his Notes on the Treatise of the Church of Lyons, entituled, *De tribus Epistolis*, the question will be soon decided. For having related on the testimony of Florus a passage of Amalarius he concludes in these terms, *Ex quo conjectura locus relinquitur Amalarium istum una cum Joanne Scoto fuisse Berengarii præcursores & veluti ante signanos*, Hence we may conjecture that this Amalarius, with John Scot were Berenger's fore-runners. If we believe M. the President Maugin, Amalarius was only a Stercoranist, of whom we shall speak hereafter. If we will believe the Author of the *Perpetuity*, Amalarius was Paschasus his Adversary; for he strongly assures us, That Bishop Usher was mistaken when he thought Amalarius's error consisted in holding the Doctrine of the Roman Catholics, not only because this supposition is without any ground, but also because the Epitomy of William of Malsbury joyns Amalarius with Heribald and Raban who were Paschasus his Adversaries. But in short, if we will consult Mr. Arnaud, he will tell us on the contrary, that Amalarius and Heribald were in no wise adversaries to Paschasus. That the Author of the *Perpetuity* granted it because he believed William of Malsbury said it, but that this does not appear to be true. That Amalarius indeed was a Sterconarist, but yet never any body taught more expressly the Real Presence. Thus these Gentlemen, who so greatly insult over us, when they find any difference amongst us Ministers in the least point of History, or conjecture, do not always agree amongst themselves, one says, Amalarius was the fore-runner of Berenger, the other maintains that never any man taught more formally the Real Presence; the one makes him together with Heribald and Raban a bitter enemy to Paschasus, and th'other protests 'tis not likely to be true.

Prefat. ad lib.  
de Offic. Eccl.

**T**O clear up this confusion, we must have recourse to the passages of Amalarius, and judg of his Doctrine from it self. He tells us then first, That those things which are done in the celebration of the Mass, are transacted as in a Sacrament of our Lords Passion, as he himself commands us, saying, Every time you do this, do it in remembrance of me; and therefore the Priest who immolates the Bread and Wine, is in Sacrament of Christ, the Bread, the Wine and Water and Wine are for Sacraments of the Flesh and Blood of Christ. The Sacraments must have some resemblance with the things of which they be Sacraments. Let the Priest then be like our Saviour Christ, as the Bread, the Wine and Liquors are like the Body of Jesus Christ. It appears from these words, that in the stile of Amalarius, to be a Sacrament of a thing is to represent it, and hold the place of it, for this is precisely what these terms signifie, The things of the Mass are done IN SACRAMENT of our Lords Passion, and these other terms, the Priest is in Sacrament of Christ. When then he adds, that the Bread, the Wine and Water are in SACRAMENT of the Flesh and Blood of Jesus Christ, it is clear he means they stand in stead of it, and represent them, and this resemblance which he



he inserts afterwards between the Bread, the Wine and the Water, and the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, because they are the Sacraments of 'em, confirm the same thing, and at the same time formally distinguishes them from the Body and Blood themselves.

Mr. ARNAUD answers that *Amalarius* has follow'd the language of *Book 8. ch. 4. sense, and that the question here was not to explain the nature of the Eucha-* P. 783.  
*rist, but the mysterious references which God would engrave in the symbols which he has chosen in this mystery.* But what reason has Mr. Arnaud to make *Amalarius* to have follow'd the language of sense in opposition to that of Faith, seeing *Amalarius* does not mention any thing that leads to this distinction, and that on the contrary it appears by the terms which he makes use of, that he honestly meant the Eucharist was real Bread and Wine in substance. Who told Mr. Arnaud that *Amalarius* made not the nature of the Eucharist to consist in the whole action's being a Sacrament of our Lords Passion, that the Priest immolates the Bread and Wine, that he represents therein our Saviour Christ, and that the Bread and Wine stand for his Body and Blood? We must judge of *Amalarius* his Doctrine by his expressions. To be in Sacrament, according to him, is to represent and stand for, the Bread and Wine are in Sacrament of the Body and Blood, as the Priest is in Sacrament of Jesus Christ, they are not then really this Body and Blood.

AMALARIUS himself does clearly explain his mind in another Lib. 3. de Off. cap. 25.  
 place, saying, *That the Priest bows himself, and recommends to God what is immolated in the stead of Jesus Christ. Hoc quod vice Christi immolatum est Deo patri commendat.* Mr. Arnaud says this is not an expression contrary to the Real Presence, because *Agapinus* has made use of it, and that in effect this expression is grounded on the different state wherein Jesus Christ is in the Eucharist, and that wherein he has been in his Passion, and that wherein he now is in Heaven. For this diversity distinguishing him to our senses, it makes one distinguish him likewise in the expressions, But all this is but a mere evasion, *Amalarius* does not say that Jesus Christ in one state, holds the place of himself in another state. He ingenuously says, *that which is immolated in the stead of Jesus Christ; and if you would know what he means by what is immolated in the place of Jesus Christ, he has already told you that 'tis Bread and Wine which are immolated, and which are in Sacrament of the Flesh and Blood of Christ.* Book 8. ch. 7. page 834.

HE says moreover the same thing elsewhere, *The Oblation and the Cup* Lib. 3. de Off. cap. 26.  
*signifie our Lords Body, and when Jesus Christ has said, This is the Cup of my Blood, he meant his Blood which was in his Body, as the Wine was in the Cup.* And a little further, *By this particle of the Oblation which the Priest puts in the Cup, he represents the Body of Jesus Christ, which is risen from the dead, by that which the Priest or the People eat, is represented this Body of Jesus Christ, which is still on the Earth (to wit his Church) and by that which remains on the Altar, is represented this other Body which is still lying in the Sepulchre (to wit, the faithful dead.)*

IT is in vain that Mr. Arnaud opposes to these passages what the same *Amalarius* says, *That the Church believes this Sacrament ought to be eaten by* Book 8. ch. 4; P. 783.  
*men, because she believes 'tis our Lords Body and Blood, and that in eating it the Souls of the Faithful are fill'd with benediction.* For 'tis true that the reason for which the Church recommends to the Faithful the eating of the Eucharist,

Eucharist, is because 'tis the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, this is not a matter in contest, the question is only to know in what manner this is.

*ibid.*

'TIS moreover in vain that Mr. Arnaud urges these other words, *Credimus naturam simplicem panis & vini mixti verti in naturam rationabilem, scilicet Corporis & Sanguinis Christi*. We believe that the simple nature of Bread and Wine is changed into a reasonable nature, to wit, of the Body and Blood of Christ. For his sense is not that there's made a real conversion of one nature into another, but that there's made a mystical conversion by which 'tis no longer mere Bread and Wine, but the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, or as himself says elsewhere several times the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ.

'TIS also no less in vain that Mr. Arnaud endeavours to make advantage of some terms of Amalarius his Letter to Guntard, which may be seen in Spicilege's seventh Volume. Guntard was a young man that was scandaliz'd at his seeing Amalarius spitting without any scruple immediately after his receiving the Communion, Amalarius answers him that this was a thing natural and necessary to the preservation of health, and that he thought he did nothing herein which cast any dishonor on the Body of Christ, that if he imagin'd he cast out, in spitting, the Body of Christ, he was deceived. *That he would say to him touching the Body of Jesus Christ which we receive, what the Emperor Valentinian said to his Army. 'Twas in your power to choose me Emperor, but now 'tis in mine to choose whom I please for my Colleague. 'Tis the same here, for 'tis your part to have a pure heart, and to beseech God to give it you; but 'tis his to disperse his Body throughout our members, and veins, for our salvation. For 'tis he who in giving the Bread to his Apostles has said, This is my Body which shall be given for you. His Body was on the Earth when he would, and it is there when he pleases; yea, after his Ascension he has not disdain'd to shew himself to S. Paul in the Temple of Jerusalem which was on earth.* His sense is, that we ought not to trouble our selves about what becomes of the mystical Body of Jesus Christ which we receive in the Eucharist, that 'tis our part to purifie our hearts, and his to give us his Body in the manner which he thinks fitting; because 'twas he that said of the Bread of the Eucharist, that 'twas his Body. What he adds concerning his Body being on the Earth, &c. he says it not with respect to the Real Presence, as Mr. Arnaud imagins, but in reference to the right which our Saviour has to make his Eucharistical Body what he pleases. For 'tis an argument *à pari* (as we call it) by which he undertakes to prove that Jesus Christ is the master of his Eucharistical Body, as well as the master of his natural Body, having left it on Earth as long as he thought fitting, and after his Ascension was not so taken up with his abode in Heaven, as not to shew himself to his Apostle in the Temple of Jerusalem. And this appears from the sequel of his discourse. *I say this, says he, to the end that if thro ignorance, or without my consent there should proceed out of my mouth any part of the Lords Body, you may not believe presently hereupon that I am void of Religion, and that I despise my Lords Body, or that this Body be carried into any place where he would not have it come. Our Soul lives by this Body, as the Lord himself says, If you eat not the Flesh of the Son of Man, nor drink his Blood, you have no life in you. If then this Body be our life, it will not lose being separated from us what it has in it self, and what we receive from it. My Son, desire your Priests to take heed they lose not out of their hearts any of those words which the Lord has spoken in the Gospel,*

*Gospel, for they are likewise our Life, as well as the Consecrated Bread.* He means, that altho he casts out of his mouth in spitting some part of the Eucharistical Body, yet we must not believe this Body is carried to any place where our Saviour would not have it, or this Body being in this place lies stript of the advantage which it has to be the life of our souls, no more than the words of the Gospel, which altho neglected, be yet also our life. What signifies this to the Real Presence? Will not his discourse be every whit as coherent and as well followed if we suppose that the consecrated Bread is the Body of Jesus Christ in Sacrament as he teaches elsewhere, as if we suppose it to be so in propriety of substance, which we believe that *Amalarius* never taught.

THE conclusion which he draws from all this is yet (if you will) less favourable to Mr. Arnaud. Thus, says he, *having taken with an honest and faithful heart the Lords Body, I have nothing to do to dispute whether it be invisibly carried up into Heaven, or reserved in our Body till the day of Judgment, or whether exhaled up in the Air, or whether it flows from our Body with the Blood when our Veins be opened, or issues out thro the Pores, the Lord saying, Whatsoever enters by the mouth into the belly goes into Excrement.* Which is to say, that it belongs not to us to make all these questions about the Sacrament, because our Saviour does with it what he pleases. As to our parts, adds he, *we ought only to have a care lest we receive it with a Judas's heart, lest we despise it; but on the contrary discern it salutarily from other common aliments.* I confess Mr. Arnaud has some reason to conjecture hence that *Amalarius* was of the number of those which they call Stercoranists, but on what side soever he turns himself, he cannot conclude he held the Real Presence, and this very thing that Mr. Arnaud believes *Amalarius* was a Stercoranist ought to convince him on the contrary that this Author did not believe the change, or conversion of the substance in the Eucharist.

HAD Mr. Arnaud consulted the Letter of the same *Amalarius* to *Rangar*, which is within two pages of that which he wrote to *Grunnard*, he had seen that *Amalarius* expounds these words of Jesus Christ, *This is the Cup of the New Testament in my Blood which is shed for you*, in this manner, *This Cup is a figure of my Body, in which is the Blood which shall issue from my side to accomplish the ancient Law, and when 'tis spilt it shall be the New Testament, because 'tis a new and innocent Blood, the Blood of the Man without Sin, which shall be spilt for the Redemption of Mankind.* Explaining afterwards what is said in the Liturgy, *Mysterium fidei: This Blood*, says he, *is called the mystery of Faith, because it profits to the Salvation and Eternal Life of him that believes himself Redeemed by this Blood, and makes himself an imitator of our Lords Passion. And therefore the Lord says, If yee eat not the Flesh of the Son of man, nor drink his Blood, yee will have no life in you. Which is to say, if ye partake not of my Passion, nor believe that I died for your salvation, yee will have no life in you. The mystery is Faith, as S. Augustin teaches in his Epistle to Boniface, as in some manner the Sacrament of the Body of Jesus Christ is the Body of Jesus Christ, the Sacrament of the Blood of Jesus Christ is the Blood of Jesus Christ, so the Sacrament of Faith is Faith.* 'Tis plainly seen this is not the stile of a man that believed the Real Presence.

BUT before we leave *Amalarius*, we must joyn him to *Heribald* and *Raban*, for they stand all three accused by several Authors with Stercoranism,



Tom. 2. cap. 19.  
Lib. 8. cap. 12.  
p. 374.

In instit. Cleric.  
c. 31.

Durand. de  
Corp. & Sang.  
Dom. part. 1.

nism, which is to say, they believ'd that what we receive in the Sacrament, is digested and subject to the necessity of other food which passes into Excrements. *William of Malmsbury* in his epitomis'd Manuscript, as the Author of the *Perpetuity* acknowledges, attributes to all three of 'em this opinion. The President *Maugin* affirms the same thing of *Amalarius*, and Mr. *Arnaud* says his proofs be good. And the anonymous Author publish'd by *Cellot* the Jesuit, attributes the same sentiment to *Heribald*, and *Raban*, without any mention of *Amalarius*, *Et his quidem*, says he, *qui dixerunt secessui obnoxium (quid nunquam antea auditum est) id est, Heribaldo Antisiodorensi Episcopo qui turpiter proposuit, & Rabano Moguntino qui turpius assumpsit, turpissime vero conclusit, suus ad respondendum locus servetur.* *Thomas Waldensis* attributes it in like manner to *Heribald* and *Raban*, *Heribaldus*, says he, *Antisiodorensis Episcopus & Rabanus Moguntinus posuerunt Eucharistiae Sacramentum obnoxium esse secessui.* Mr. *Arnaud* endeavours to substract *Raban* from this number, *The single testimony*, says he, *of an Author so little judicious as this anonymous, is not sufficient to impute this sentiment to Raban, there being elsewhere nothing in his works but what may receive a good sense.* But has he so soon forgotten what he himself wrote eight lines above. *Raban* is accused of the error of the *Stercoranists* by an anonymous Author, and by *William of Malmsbury*. This anonymous is not the only Author that gives this testimony, *William of Malmsbury* asserts the same: why then does Mr. *Arnaud* say eight lines after, *The single testimony of this anonymous Author is not enough?* If his single testimony be not sufficient, that of *William of Malmsbury* will confirm it; and if these two be not sufficient, *Thomas Waldensis* will give 'em his suffrage as I now mention'd. Even *Raban* himself sufficiently explains his own sentiment, without any need of other witnesses; for observe here what he writes in his fifth Book, *De naturis rerum*; *The Lord would have the Sacraments of his Body and Blood to be received by the mouths of the Faithful, and serve 'em for food (in pastum eorum redigi, others read in partem eorum redigi) to the end this visible effect should represent the invisible effect. For as material food nourishes and strengthens the Body, so the Word of God inwardly nourishes our souls.* And in his Book of the instruction of *Ecclesiasticks*, he formally reaches, *that the Sacrament is taken with the mouth, reduced into nourishment for our Bodies, and converted or changed in us when we eat it.* There is no explication can shift the force and consequence of these terms.

THE question is now whether the opinion of these persons, who have been since odiously called by way of reproach *Stercoranists*, be consistent with the Real Presence, or whether it supposes that the substance of Bread remains in the Eucharist. If we consult *Durand* of *Troarn* to know what these *Stercoranists* were, he will tell us that in his time they were accounted the same persons who maintain'd that the substances of Bread and Wine remain'd after the Consecration. *They say*, says he, *that the gifts of Bread and Wine which are laid on the Altar remain after the Consecration what they were before, and are yet in some sort the true Body and true Blood of Jesus Christ, not naturally, but in figure, And that the substances of the Divine Oblation are corruptible and digested with other meats.* He says the same thing afterwards in two or three several places, and calls these people *Stercoranists*, without mentioning several kinds of 'em, as that some of 'em are for having the substance it self of Christ's Body to be subject to these accidents, and others who understood it of the substance of Bread.

IT also appears from the Dispute of *Guitmond*, that this was the sentiment of *Berenger* and his followers, for he introduces 'em thus arguing, *'Tis absurd to expose the Body of Jesus Christ to the necessity of Excrements. Let whatsoever enters into the mouth, as our Saviour says, descends into the stomach, and is cast into the draught. From this visible and corporeal manducation in the Sacrament, says Algerus, has sprung the filthy Heresie of the Stercoranists. For they say that so great a Sacrament being eaten corporally is likewise subject to Excrements. Which they endeavour to strengthen by several arguments, and especially by the words of Jesus Christ, who says in the Gospel, Whatsoever enters into the mouth, descends into the stomach, and is cast forth into the draught.*

*Guitmond. de]*  
*verb. Euchar.*  
*lib. 2.*

*Alger. de Sac.*  
*lib. 2. cap. 7.*

IT WILL be said it hence plainly appears that the Berengarians were Stercoranists, seeing they believ'd that the substance of Bread remain'd after the Consecration, but that it does not hence follow that all the Stercoranists, and especially *Heribald* and *Raban* held in like manner the subsistence of the Bread and Wine. I answer, It belongs to Mr. *Arnaud* to shew us that there were two sorts of Stercoranists, the one who held the Real Presence, and others that did not believe it. For why must we be led by his authority? we shew that those who were accused of Stercoranism are the same as were oppos'd for not believing Transubstantiation. If Mr. *Arnaud* will needs have that there were two sorts, 'tis his part to prove it, for as long as he supposes this without proof, we have right to deny it him. Yet will it be no hard matter to convince him that this same Stercoranism which Authors attribute to *Heribald* and *Raban*, is nothing else than the belief of the subsistence of the Bread and Wine in the Eucharist, which is to say in a word that 'tis exactly the opinion of *Berenger*, and that 'twas only to render it odious that their adversaries expos'd it under this idea, or representation of Stercoranism. Which is what justifies it self from the testimony of *Thomas Waldensis*, who tells us that a subtil Doctor of his time said, *We should interrogate the Priests, whether they did not think that this thing which they believ'd to be the Flesh of Christ was tasted with ones bodily mouth, and whether being received into the stomach it went into the draught, according as, adds he, the vile Sect of the Heribaldiens and Lollards taught, for they say ALL, that this Bread which they imprudently call THE NATURAL BREAD, is the august Sacrament and consecrated Host.* Here I think we have the Heribaldiens who formally say that the Sacrament, the consecrated Host, which according to them passes into Excrements, is, *The natural Bread.* The aforesaid *Waldensis* disputing in the sequel against *Wicliff*, says, *that Wicliff proved that the Eucharist was Bread by the experience of nature, because a man may be fed with Hosts. Whence, adds he, I conclude that as he admits the digestion of the Eucharist, he must likewise grant that it passes into Excrements. And thus is he agreed with Heribald and Raban of Mayence, who have taught that the true Sacrament was subject to the casualty of other food. 'Tis plain he puts no difference between the Stercoranism of these two Bishops, and the subsistence of the Bread of Wicliff. Elsewhere he also more clearly proves that Honorius of Autun believed that the substance of Bread remained, or as he speaks, that he was of the Sect of the Panites, because he alledges the passage of Raban, which bears that the Sacrament passes into our food. Et ipse enim, says he, de secta Panitarum, Rabani ver-*

*Thom. Waldens.*  
*tom. 2. cap. 52.*

*ibid. cap. 26.*

*ibid. cap. 90.*

*sum ponit infra ubi agit de partibus Missæ, Sacramentum, inquit, ore percipitur, & in alimentum corporis redigitur.*

BUT if we will besides the testimonies of these Authors hearken moreover unto reason, we shall find that there is nothing more inconsistent with the belief of the Real Presence than this pretended error of the Stercoranists; and that those who will have these two opinions agree together, have never well considered what they undertook to establish. It is not possible to believe the Real Presence of the Body of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist, I mean of this same numerical substance which was born of the Virgin, and is now in Heaven, without believing at the same time that this substance is not sensible in it, palpable, visible, extended, capable of being divided in the same manner as 'twas when our Lord conversed on Earth. 'Twill be the greatest folly imaginable to impute to persons that have eyes, and see the Eucharist, and have some remains of common sense to make therein exist this Body without making it therein exist insensible, indivisible, impalpable after the manner of spirits, as they also do of the Church of *Rome*. Now with what likelihood can one make this opinion agree with that of Stercoranism, which asserts that this Body is digested into the stomach after the manner of other meats, that one part of it passes into our nourishment, and the other is subject to the common necessity of aliments. What is digested is touched by the substance of our stomach, penetrated by our natural heat, divided and separated into several parts, reduced into Chyle, then into Blood, distributed thro' all the several parts of our Body, and joyn'd immediately to 'em, after it has been made like 'em, whilst that which is most gross and improper for our nourishment passes into Excrement. What likelihood is there that persons who are not bereft of their senses can subject to these accidents, an indivisible and impalpable substance, which exists after the manner of Spirits? Moreover they were not ignorant that the Body of Jesus Christ is animated with its natural Soul, and that what passes into our nourishment is animated by ours, what a monstrous opinion then is it to imagin that the same numerical Body can be at the same time animated with two Souls, with that of Jesus Christ and ours, to be united hypostatically to the Word, and hypostatically to us? On what hand soever we turn, 'tis certain that 'tis an inexpressible chimera to say that those which were called Stercoranists believ'd the Real Presence in the sense which the Roman Church understands it. It must be acknowledged that they were *Panites*, as *Thomas Waldensis* calls them, that is to say, they believ'd that the Eucharist was a Real Substance of Bread. And seeing we shew'd that *Amalarius*, *Heribald*, and *Raban* were of the number of these pretended Stercoranists, it must be necessarily acknowledged that they were contrary to the Doctrine of *Paschasius*, whence it evidently follows that this Doctrine was not commonly held in the Church then, as Mr. *Arnaud* pretends it was. For these three great men held in it too considerable a rank to permit us to believe they were contrary to the publick Belief in a point so considerable, and Mr. *Arnaud* himself will not have us think thus of 'em. One of 'em, to wit, *Amalarius*, was sent to *Rome* by the Emperor *Lewis* to seek the Antiphonaries, as he himself testifies. The other, to wit, *Heribald*, was Bishop of *Auxerre*, and reputed a Saint after his death; as appears from the Inscription of his Sepulchre, *Here lies the Body of S. Heribald*; and the last, to wit, *Raban*, was Abbot of *Fulde*, and afterwards Arch-Bishop of *Mayence*, accounted one of the most learned men of his Age, as appears by the testimonies of *Baronius* and *Sixtus* of *Sienna*.



TO these three we must add *Bertram*, for it cannot be doubted but that he was also one of those who were afterwards called *Stercoranists*, which is to say, he believ'd that this substance which we receive in the Sacrament was subject to digestion, and passed into our nourishment. He clearly shews his sense in several places of his Book. For having related these words, of *Isidor*, *The Bread and Wine are compared to the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, because that as the substance of this visible Bread and Wine inebriate the outward man, so the Word of God, which is the living Bread cheers the faithful Soul, when she participates of it*, he makes this remark. Saying this he clearly confesses, that whatsoever we take outwardly in the Sacrament of our Lords Body and Blood, is used for nourishment to our Body. And a little further, *Secundum visibilem creaturam, corpus pascunt*. And speaking afterwards of the Eucharistical Body of Jesus Christ, *Negari non potest corrumpi, quod per partes comminutum disparitur ad sumendum & dentibus commolitur in corpus trahitur*. And again, *Non attenditur quod corpus pascit, quod dente premitur, quod per partes comminuitur, sed quod in fide spiritualiter accipitur*.

*Bertram de Corp. & Sang. Dom.*

THESE two last Authors, to wit, *Raban* and *Bertram*, besides this Doctrine which is common to 'em with the rest, have especially this, that they have formally opposed the novelties of *Paschasus* by publick Writings. Which is what appears by the testimony of the anonymous Author whose words we have already related; for he says in proper terms, that *Raban* and *Ratram* wrote against *Paschasus*; to wit, *Raban* a Letter to the Abbot *Egilon*, and *Ratram* a Book dedicated to King *Charles*, and that they defamed him for offering this proposition, that what we receive from the Altar is nothing else but the same Flesh which was born of the Virgin, and suffered on the Cross, and rose again from the Sepulchre, and is at this day offered for the sins of the world.

WE have no reason, says Mr. *Arnaud*, to believe that *Raban* attack'd *Paschasus* otherwise than *Bertram*. Now *Bertram* does not any where name *Paschasus*, and not only, he does not attack him openly, but shuns to appear contrary to him, so that it cannot be concluded from the testimony of this Author, that *Raban* was an adversary to *Paschasus* his Book. Why can it not be concluded from the testimony of this Author, seeing this Author formally says it? Can Mr. *Arnaud* that never saw this Letter to *Egilon* better judge of it, than this Author that did see it? Supposing *Raban* did not name *Paschasus*, it will not follow that he did not attack his Book; for a man may write against a Book, and yet not name the Author of it. 'Twas a sufficient attacking the Book to combat precisely and directly the fundamental and essential proposition which *Paschasus* came from establishing in it, which was, that what we receive in the Communion is the same Flesh of Jesus Christ which was born of the Virgin.

*Book 8. ch. 12. P. 874.*

THIS anonymous Author, says moreover Mr. *Arnaud*, is the only person that speaks of this Letter of *Raban* to *Egilon*. 'Twas never cited either by *Berenger*, nor by any other Author, 'twas unknown to all the Writers of the 11th. Century. Supposing what Mr. *Arnaud* says were true, yet would it not be sufficient for the calling in question the sincerity of this anonymous Author who speaks of this Letter as of that which he saw. But besides this Mr. *Arnaud* hazards himself too much when he positively affirms that this,

*ibidem.*

is the only Author who speaks of this Letter of *Raban* to *Egilon*. He may be convinced of the contrary by *Raban* himself who acknowledges it, and makes express mention of it on the same subject of *Paschasus* his Doctrin, and in the same sense which the anonymous does, excepting the name of *Paschasus* which he does not express, which plainly defends the sincerity of this nameless Author, *Quidam nuper de ipso Sacramento Corporis & Sanguinis Domini non rite sentientes dixerunt hoc ipsum Corpus & Sanguinem Domini quod de Maria Virgine natum est, & in quo ipse Dominus passus est in cruce & resurrexit de Sepulchro; cui errori quantum potuimus ad Egilum Abbatem scribentes de corpore ipso quid vere credendum sit aperuimus.*

Par. Rab. c. 33.

Page 873.

Baron. ad ann.  
847.

Lugd. Eccles.  
de senend. ver.  
Script.

*BU T* supposing 'twere true, says Mr. Arnaud, that *Raban* did in effect contradict *Paschasus*, this will be but of small advantage to Mr. Claude. Which he endeavours to prove afterwards by the example of several great Wits, and famous Bishops who have attack'd the Divinity of Jesus Christ. He adds, That *Raban* was as other men are, as appears by one of his Letters which the Church of Lyons refuted, that it cannot appear strange he should fall into an error touching the Eucharist, and that the qualities of a Philosopher, Rhetorician, Astronomer, and Poet, could not render him incapable of being deceived. Supposing we had only *Raban* to oppose against *Paschasus*, the advantage would not be inconsiderable. *Paschasus* was only a mean Religious, when *Raban* was Abbot of *Fulde*, and when *Paschasus* came to be Abbot of *Corbie*, *Raban* was Arch-Bishop of *Mayence*; whence it follows that the authority of the one was far greater than that of the other. As to knowledge, it cannot be denied but *Raban* infinitely excelled *Paschasus*, not in the mere qualities of a Philosopher, Rhetorician, Astronomer and Poet, altho these qualifications do much set off a Scholar: but by the Epithet which *Baronius* gives him, *Audi*, says he, *quid vertex hujus temporis Theologorum Rabanus decreverit*. Mr. Arnaud cannot propose *Paschasus* but only as the single person of his Party; now were it the same with us in respect of *Raban*, 'tis certain that the presumption would be wholly for this last, and that 'tis apparently better to bring the Church on *Raban*'s side, than on *Paschasus*'s. But we are not in these Circumstances. The Doctrin of *Raban* agrees very well with that of other Authors, his Contemporaries; that of *Paschasus* agrees with none of 'em. The Doctrin of *Raban* has disturb'd no body, but that of *Paschasus* set several persons against him of his own time. There's not the least reason for accusing *Raban* of Innovation, but there are very strong proofs whereby to conclude that *Paschasus* was an Innovator. It signifies nothing to say, that *Raban* was as other men are, as appears by one of his Letters which the Church of Lyons has refuted: for should a man rigorously examin *Paschasus* his Writings, he will find more marks of human weakness than in those of *Raban*: besides that from this very thing that *Raban* had the Church of Lyons for his Adversary, one may hence conclude, according to Mr. Arnaud's way of reasoning, that his Doctrin on the Eucharist differed not from that of his time; for otherwise 'tis likely that the Church of Lyons would not have spared him on such an important Article: and yet instead of this we find on the contrary that when this Church her self spake of the Eucharist, it has been in terms which do not at all favour the Real Presence. When our Saviour Christ, says she, gave to his Disciples the Sacrament of his Body and Blood, he says, *Take, eat, this is my Body which is given for you*: which insinuates that she understood these words, *This is my Body*, in this sense, *This is the Sacrament of my Body*. And a little further, *The Oblation of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, which is*

to say, the mystery of his Passion and Death. The example of these great Wits and Bishops that have attackt the Divinity of Jesus Christ, does indeed shew that 'twas not impossible for *Raban* to fall into error, which is what we do not at present dispute, for there's no body infallible, no not *Mr. Arnaud* himself: but this example concludes the same thing of *Paschasius*, who was no more infallible than others. So far they stand upon equal ground, both men, and both liable to error. It remains to know which of the two actually fell into error, and that this example of the Bishops does not decide.

*IT signifies nothing*, adds *Mr. Arnaud*, to say that no body ever reproach'd him with this error, for it does not appear that any other Author, save the *Anonymous*, saw this Letter to *Egilon*, so that the only person that had knowledge of it has condemned it. *Raban* did not keep this Letter secret, seeing he has himself made mention of it in his *Penitentials*, and says he did it against the error of those who say that the Sacrament was the Real Body and Blood of Jesus Christ born of the Virgin. Those who saw not his Letter might easily comprehend by these words the substance of it, and for what end he design'd it, if they have not condemned it 'twas their fault. Yet do we not pretend to draw hence any great advantage. But moreover, says *Mr. Arnaud*, how many errors are there in Authors which have been never taken notice of by any person, nor reproached to those that taught 'em? There are strange instances of this, and here is one from amongst the rest which is singular in its kind. *Photius* testifies that *Theodorus Mospueste* wrote a Book against the Doctrin of Original Sin. Both East and West have been as greatly animated against this Author as can be imagin'd. He was condemned even after his Death in the fifth Council: There was never then any person to be less favoured than he. Yet we do not find that this Capital Error observed by *Photius* has been Animadverted by any Author of the 6th. Century in the very time when *Theodorus* was used with most severity. We must acknowledge with *Mr. Arnaud* that these kind of arguments by which we conclude that if a Doctrin has not been condemn'd by a Church, it follows that this Church has held it and approved it, are not convincing, and what he relates of *Theodorus* of *Mospueste* is a considerable argument of it. But it must also be granted that never man was more at variance with himself than *Mr. Arnaud*; for what he now said overthrows the better part of his Book. Those that have read it may remember that the greatest part of his dispute touching the Greeks is reduced to negative arguments, perfectly like unto those which he now condemns. The Greeks, says he without ceasing, have not condemned then Transubstantiation of the Latins. Therefore they believed it with 'em. *Cerularius* did not concern himself at *Berenger's* condemnation, he believed the Transubstantiation. *Humbert* did not reproach the Greeks with their not believing the Real Presence, and *Nicetas* did not reproach the Latins with their believing it; therefore they were agreed in this Article. We can scarcely meet with any thing else but these kind of conclusions in every page. He does the same on the subject of the other Schismatical Churches, he argues from the silence of the Emissaries, the silence of the Popes, the silence of the Armenians, and that of the Nestorians and others. When the question concern'd the 12th. Century, how many times has he remembered the necessity of the Disputes of the Paschasists and Bertramists; how many prodigious exclamations has he made at their not being condemned, at their not baiting one another? And when the discourse was about *Paschasius*, and the Innovation which we charge him with,

Book 8, ch. 12.  
p. 875.



with, with what exaggerations has he not urged this argument, That *Paschasus* was not publickly reprehended by any person for thirty years, was never punish'd, nor admonish'd that he offered a Doctrine contrary to the Church. Apply I pray you to this Rhetorick, what he says now of this great number of errors in Ecclesiastical Authors which have been never animadverted by any body, nor reproach'd to those who have taught 'em. Add hereunto his example of *Theodorus* of *Mospueste*, and that of *John Scot*, of whom he says likewise afterwards, that it does not appear that these errors have been condemned by any Ecclesiastical Censure of that Age, and that of *Raban*; for he supposes he might have erred on the Eucharist by a capital Error in denying the Real Presence, and he affirms that in this case 'twill not be strange that never any body reproach'd him with this Error: lay I say all this together, and make a reform on this ground of Mr. *Arnaud's* Book, retrench whatsoever agrees not with this rule which he here gives us, and I am sure you'll reduce his Volume into a less compass by half.

Page 876:

AFTER these first Answers with which Mr. *Arnaud* was not perhaps well satisfi'd, he hazards another, which is, that this proposition, *That the Sacrament of the Eucharist is not the Real Body born of the Virgin*, may have two senses, the one that the external part of the Sacrament, which is to say the visible vail is not really the Body of Jesus Christ, that the Body of Jesus Christ is not really white, round, and has not in it self all these sensible accidents which appear to us; the other, that the Body of Jesus Christ is not really contain'd in the Sacrament. He pretends that *Raban* denied this proposition only in the first sense, and not in the second. But this answer has neither sincerity nor truth in it. First, it confounds what ought necessarily to be distinguish'd. For 'tis not the same thing to believe that the visible Vail, which is to say, the accidents of Bread, are really the Body of Jesus Christ, and to believe that the Body of Jesus Christ is white and round, and has in it self all the sensible accidents which appear to us. There is a great deal of difference between these two, as any man may see. Supposing a man believed that the Body of Jesus Christ is white and round, 'twill not hence follow he must say that this whiteness and this roundness, which are the Vail which Mr. *Arnaud* speaks of, were really the Body of Jesus Christ. In the second place, I do not think that ever any body imagin'd that these sensible accidents of whiteness and roundness in abstracto, as they term it, are really the Body of Jesus Christ, and whosoever imputes to *Raban* the combating of this fancy, charges him with opposing such an imagination as never yet entred into any bodies mind.

AS to the other proposition, That the Body of Jesus Christ is really white and round, as 'tis not customary to express it in these terms, *That the Eucharist is the same Body which was born of the Virgin*, so 'tis not usual to refute it in these, *That the Eucharist is not the same Body which was born of the Virgin*; and this explication of Mr. *Arnaud* is so forced, and remote from the natural sense of *Raban* his words, that there are few reasonable persons to whom 'twill not appear a pitiful evasion.

YET does Mr. *Arnaud* earnestly urge not only that 'twas the sense of *Raban* to attack this Proposition, but likewise that of *Bertram*, in his Book *De Corpore & Sanguine Domini*. And altho the anonymous Author, who according to all probability lived about the 9th. Century, expressly says, that *Raban* and *Bertram* refuted *Paschasus*. Yet does Mr. *Arnaud* affirm the contrary;

contrary, and says that he demonstratively proves it. He says for this effect, *That there were people in that time who grossly said that the Body of Jesus Christ was such as the Sacrament appeared to be, which is to say, that the Body of Jesus Christ has really the form of Bread. - That this opinion was a necessary consequence of that of Amalarius, that 'tis from thence he concluded that the Body of Jesus Christ issued thro the pores, and applied unto it these words, Omne quod in os intrat, in ventrem vadit, & in secessum emittitur. That it is apparent from the accusation which Florus forms against him of having corrupted France by these fantastical opinions, that Amalarius had his Disciples. Here then, adds he, we have people, who said in the time of Charles the Bald, and who must say according to their Principles, That the Body of Jesus Christ has all the external accidents which appear to our senses, and that there was no difference between the Body of Jesus Christ born of the Virgin, and the Sacrament. So that here are persons against whom may be maintain'd in an Orthodox sense, that the Sacrament of the Eucharist is not the Body of Jesus Christ born of the Virgin. He afterwards endeavours to shew that Bertram's Book directly attacks only these persons.*

TO solve this difficulty, it must first be supposed as a thing already proved, that those who have been since called (by way of reproach) Stercoranists, cannot be those of whom Mr. Arnaud here speaks; who according to him believing the Real Presence, yet affirm'd that the Body of Jesus Christ had all the sensible accidents which appear in the Eucharist, and that Mr. Arnaud could say nothing less to the purpose than what he has offered, *That this opinion was a necessary consequence of that of Amalarius, that 'tis from thence he concluded the Body of Jesus Christ issued out thro the pores, applying to it these words, Omne quod in os intrat, in ventrem vadit & in secessum emittitur.* We have already seen from the testimony of *Tho. Waldensis*, that these Stercoranists were *Panites*, which is to say, that they conserved the substance of Bread in the Sacrament, and said all of 'em that the Sacrament was *natural Bread*. We have already seen that in effect the belief of the Real Presence is absolutely inconsistent with this opinion, that the Sacrament passes into our nourishment, that it is digested, that one part of it is changed into our flesh, and another part into Excrements.

SECONDLY, we must observe that supposing 'twere true the Stercoranists believ'd, as Mr. Arnaud would have it, that the sensible accidents really affect the Body of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist, there could be nothing more absurd than to imagin they were those whom *Raban* and *Bertram* opposed. For as to *Raban* it appears as well from the testimony of the anonymous Author, as by that of *Waldensis*, that he was himself a Stercoranist. The same thing appears from the proper passages of *Raban*, which I have already related. Whereunto I shall add another, taken out of his *Penitential*, *Touching what you have demanded of me, whether the Eucharist* cap. 33. *when it has been consum'd, and pass'd into Excrements like other meats, returns again to its first nature which it had before 'twas Consecrated on the Altar. (This opinion is contrary to that of Pope Clement, and several other Holy Fathers, who say, that the Body of our Lord does not go into the draught with other meats.) Such a question is superfluous, seeing our Saviour says himself in the Gospel, Whatsoever enters into the mouth descends into the stomach and is cast into the draught. The Sacrament of the Body and Blood is made of visible and corporeal things, but ope-*

This Period which I have included in this Parenthesis has no coherence with the discourse of *Raban*, and my conjecture is, that it is a remark which some body put in the Margin, and which has been afterwards forced out of the Margin into the Text.

rates invisibly our sanctification and salvation of both Body and Soul. What reason is there to say that what is digested in the stomach, and passes into Excrements, returns again to its first state, seeing no body ever maintain'd that this happens. I think we have clearly here the opinion of Raban on this subject, and that now it cannot be any longer question'd whether he was a Stercoranist. As to Bertram, the passages which I related out of his Book do clearly shew that he was of the same sentiment. What can be more unreasonable and worse contriv'd than this thought of Mr. Arnaud, that Raban and Bertram have combated the opinion of the Stercoranists, which is to say, that they have fought against themselves, and wrote Books against persons without knowing they were themselves of their party. Mr. Arnaud could not say any thing more unlikely, and therefore we see that great Wits who believe 'emselfs able to overthrow every thing, do oft-times overthrow themselves, and fall into labyrinths whence they cannot get out.

IN the third place, how little soever we consider this opinion, mention'd by Mr. Arnaud, and the manner in which he conceives it, we shall find 'tis impossible it should ever come into any bodies mind unless he were excessively extravagant. Not to mention how difficult it is to state how the natural accidents of Bread do unloose themselves from their proper and natural substance to fasten on that of the Body of Jesus Christ, nor how the same numerical substance can be above in Heaven indued with its own proper accidents, and here below indued really with the accidents of Bread and Wine. I shall only say, that unless a man doats extremely, he cannot imagin that the same numerical Body which is above, exists on Earth in a corporeal and material manner, as a subject ought to exist that has accidents really inherent; and yet is there in the natural manner of a real substance of Bread. For every substance that receives and really sustains the accidents of Bread, must receive and sustain them in the manner of a true substance of Bread to accommodate it self to the nature of these accidents. A substance which receives really the accidents of Bread, must have all its parts *in ordine ad se*, as the Schools speak, made as the parts of real Bread, to the end there may be some proportion between them and the accidents which it receives. And is it not an extravagancy to say that the parts of the human body of Jesus Christ, to wit, his head, his arms, and other members do exist inwardly *in ordine ad se* in the manner of the parts of Bread, as little crums. Who ever saw any thing more hollow than this Philosophy, a human Body really divisible, really palpable, really sensible of a divisibility, a palpability, and a sensibility, which is proper to it, and yet is not natural to it, but borrowed of another subject? This divisibility and this palpability of the Bread which reside really in the same substance of the Body of Jesus Christ, made it capable of all the changes which the Bread suffers, it was digested by the natural heat in the stomachs of the Communicants, and one part was reduced into their proper substance animated with their soul, living with their life, and united to them personally. What did they then believe, did they imagin that this same Body of Jesus Christ, was at the same time animated with two souls, and living with two lives, or to speak better with an hundred thousand souls, and an hundred thousand lives, to wit, that of Jesus Christ, and of those of all the Communicants of the world, personally united to the Son of God, and personally to an hundred millions of men at a time; or do they imagin that the Body of Jesus Christ is loosed from his proper and natural Soul, and dis-united hypostatically from the Word? Believe me, a man must be fallen into a dreadful disorder of mind to



to be guilty of these kind of fooleries. But if these persons of the 9th. Century against whom *Raban* and *Bertram* wrote, believed in effect all these matters, how happens it, there's no such thing to be found in Authors of those Ages; nor the following ones; and that to establish this fact, to wit, that there were persons who believ'd that the proper Body of Jesus Christ, the same numerical substance which is in Heaven, is here below really endued with the accidents of Bread, Mr. *Arnaud* could offer nothing but some few conjectures impertinently drawn from a Principle of *Amalarius*?

BUT you will say, how happens it that the passages which Mr. *Arnaud* alleges out of *Bertram* seem not directly to oppose the Doctrine of *Paschasus*, and that sometimes they both meet in their expressions? *Bertram* declares his design was against people who maintain that the mystery of the Body of Jesus Christ which is celebrated in the Church is not made under any figure, nor under any veil, but that the truth appears therein naked and manifest. He makes to himself the questions, *Whether the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, which is received in the Church by the mouth of the Faithful, be made as a mystery, or as a truth, which is to say, Whether it contains any thing conceal'd which is only perceiv'd by the eyes of Faith, or whether without the veil of any mystery the sight of the body sees outwardly that which the sight of the mind sees inwardly; so that whatsoever is done in this mystery is discovered to the view of sense.* And in the second place, *Whether it be the same Body which was born of the Virgin Mary, that suffered and died.* *Paschasus* on the other hand declares, *That it ought not to be denied that this Sacrament is a figure.* He distinguishes that which is felt outwardly from that which is hid inwardly; and teaches that one is the figure of the other, *Est autem figura vel character hoc quod exterius sentitur sed totum veritas, & nulla adumbratio quod interius percipitur.*

ALL the force of this objection consists in an equivocation. *Paschasus* takes the term of *figure* in one sense, *Bertram* takes it in another. *Bertram* affirms that the Eucharist is a figure in a sense which *Paschasus* denies. So that their Doctrines in the main cannot be more opposite than they are. And of this the readers need not to have been ignorant, had Mr. *Arnaud* been pleas'd to relate in what manner *Bertram* explains himself. For having proposed two questions in the terms which we have seen, he adds, *Let us examine the first of these questions, and to clear it from all ambiguity define what we mean by a figure, and what by truth; to the end, that having something that is certain before our eyes, we may better find the reasonable way which we ought to follow. The figure is a kind of shadow, which by means of some veils, shews us what it proposes to shew us. As for example, when we would signify the Word we call it Bread, as in the Lords Prayer, where we ask our daily bread, or as our Saviour says in the Gospel, I am the living Bread that came down from Heaven. Thus does he call himself a Vine, and his Disciples the Branches. I am, says he, the true Vine, and you are the Branches. In all which there is one thing said, and another signified. The truth on the contrary is a manifest demonstration of the thing without using either shadow, image, or veil, it being discovered by simple and natural expressions, there being nothing to be understood but what is contained in the terms. 'Tis not the same in these other examples, for our Saviour Christ is not substantially either Bread, or Vine, nor the Apostles Branches. Here then we have a figure, but in the last examples, the truth is uttered in plain and open terms. Now to apply this to the things in question, to wit, the Body and Blood of Christ. Were this my-*

stery celebrated without a figure it could not be call'd a mystery: for one cannot call that a mystery, wherein there is nothing secret, nothing remote from the corporal senses, nor hid under any veil. Tet this Bread which is made the Body of Christ by the ministry of the Priest, shews another thing outwardly to the senses, and offers another thing to the intelligence of the Faithful. Outwardly one discovers the form of Bread, its colour and savour, such as it was before. But there is another thing far more precious and excellent which is taught inwardly, a divine and heavenly thing, to wit, the Body of Jesus Christ which is therein represented, and 'tis not by the corporal senses, but by the spiritual intelligence of the Faithful that this thing is considered; taken and eaten. He says the same of the Vine, and concludes, seeing no body can deny but this is so, 'tis manifest that this Bread and this Wine are the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ figuratively.

C mment. in  
Mat. 26.

A man must shut his eyes if he cannot see he means that the Bread and Wine of the Eucharist are a mystery which represent to us the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ; and that when they be called the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ 'tis a figurative locution, like in some sort to these others in the Gospel, where our Lord is called Bread, a Vine, and his Apostles Branches. Now 'tis precisely in this sense that *Paschasus* denied the Eucharist was a figure. When our Saviour, says he, brake and gave the Bread to his Disciples, he does not say that this, or there is in this mystery a certain virtue, or a figure of my Body, but he says plainly, *This is my Body*. And a little lower, I marvel at some peoples saying 'tis a figure, and not the truth, a shadow and not the Body. And in his Letter to *Frudegard*, *Sacramentum Corporis Christi & Sanguinis quamvis Sacramentum dicatur non est aliud quam veritas & quod ipsa veritas repromisit*, which he proves by the same examples which *Bertram* alledges of simple locutions, to wit, of the Birth, Incarnation and Passion of our Saviour. These things, says he, which our Saviour did as God and Man, be Sacraments of his Grace and a mystery of Faith, and yet are they nothing but the truth, altho they be called Sacraments. And he afterwards makes this objection. These things being mysteries cannot (to wit in this quality) be either seen, or toucht, and consequently this is not a Body, and if it be not a Body, they are a figure of the Flesh and Blood of Jesus Christ, and not this Flesh and this Blood in propriety of nature. Then answering this objection, *Totum*, says he, *quod est Christus predicatur, non in figura, sed in re, & in proprietate, atque in natura*. 'Tis then plain that *Paschasus* and *Bertram* are directly opposite not only as to sense but terms. So that when *Paschasus* acknowledges there is a figure in the Eucharist, meaning by this figure, either the accidents of Bread and Wine which cover the substance of the Body of Jesus Christ, or the representation of the Passion of Jesus Christ, this expression in this sense does not hinder, but *Bertram* formally contradicted it, and that the testimony of the anonymous is true. For *Paschasus* expressly denies the Eucharist to be the Body of Jesus Christ in figure, and *Bertram* expressly affirms it.

A S. to wherein both of 'em seem to agree in saying that our senses shew it to be Bread, but that inwardly our Faith discovers therein the Body of Jesus Christ, this is but an equivocation. *Paschasus* means we must not refer our selves to the testimony of our senses in respect of the substance hidden under the accidents, and by the term of inwardly he means this substance covered with accidents which he would have us believe to be the substance of the Body of Jesus Christ. *Bertram* on the contrary argues from

from the testimony of our senses, and concludes that 'tis real Bread and real Wine in substance. For he maintains from the evidence of sense that there happens no real change. *According to the species of the creature,* says he, *and the form of visible things, the Bread and Wine do not suffer any change. And if they do not suffer any change, they are not anything else but what they were before.* And in another place, *We see not any thing that is changed in these things corporally. We must then confess, either that they be changed in another respect than that of the Body, and consequently that they are not what appears in truth* (which is to say, they are not the substance of the Body of Jesus Christ in truth, because 'twould be then invisible were it there) *but that they are another thing which yet we plainly see they are not by their proper existence. Or if this will not be acknowledg'd, it must of necessity be denied that they are the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ which will be impious to say or think.* And immediately after he concludes that the change which happens to the Bread and Wine is a change of figure; *Ut jam, says he, commutatio figurate facta esse dicatur.* He also proves there that the change which happens to the Eucharist does not make the Bread and Wine cease to be in truth what they were before. *We do not find, says he, that such a change happens here, but we find on the contrary that the same species of the creature which was before remains still.* And a little lower, *in respect of the substance of creatures they are after the Consecration what they were before; they were before Bread and Wine, and we see they remain in the same kind, altho they be consecrated.* And again he concludes that 'tis not the Body of Jesus Christ in specie, but in virtue, because our eyes do not see it, *'Tis Faith, says he, that sees whatsoever this is, the eye of the flesh discovers nothing therein, these visible things then are not the Body of Jesus Christ in specie, but in virtue.* He understands then that the testimony of our senses which shew us that they are still Bread and Wine in substance, are true, and that were the substance of the Body therein, our senses would discover it. Now this wholly contradicts the sense of Paschasus.

*I will not examin, says Mr. Arnaud, whether Bertram understands these words in another sense than Paschasus.* But why will not Mr. Arnaud do this, seeing on it depends the real opposition which is between these two Authors? *They that will contradict an Author, says Mr. Arnaud, directly, do oppose not only his sense but his words, and they never borrow the words of those whom they combat to express their own opinion.* Whosoever designs to contradict an author solidly minds particularly his sense, without troubling himself about his expressions. 'Twas enough for Bertram to refute the new Doctrin of Paschasus, and this very thing, that he uses his expressions, only more shews their opposition; for Bertram does not speak of the testimony of our senses on the subject of the Eucharist in the same terms of Paschasus, but to draw thence arguments to overthrow the pretended change of substance, and the Real Presence which Paschasus had advanced; so that this apparent conformity is no less in effect than a real contradiction.

THIS contrariety of sentiment appears still more in the second question which Bertram discusses, which is, *Whether what the Faithful receive with the mouths of their bodies in the Communion, is this same Body which was born of the Virgin, that has suffered for us, died and rose again, and is now at the right hand of the Father.* Paschasus affirms it, and endeavours to establish it by his Book. Bertram denies it and proves most strongly his negative. The one says that these things nourish in us that which is born of God, and not



that which is born of Flesh and Blood. The other answers us, that in respect of what we see, and receive corporally, which is bit with the teeth, swallowed and received into the stomach, they do not communicate eternal life; for in this respect they nourish our mortal flesh, and do not communicate any corruption. The one says, That we must not stop at the savour, nor colour of Bread; for were it changed into flesh (to wit, visibly and sensibly, as he explains himself in the same place) 'twould be no longer the Flesh of Jesus Christ. The other teaches, That seeing 'tis Faith, and not the eye of the Body which discovers the Bread to be the Body of Jesus Christ, we must hence conclude that 'tis not so in specie, but in virtute. The one ever says, that what we receive from the Altar is this same Flesh which is born of the Virgin. The other says, that this Flesh which was Crucified, and born of the Virgin consists of bones and sinews, distinguish'd into several members, and enliven'd by the spirit of a reasonable soul, having his proper life and motions. Whereas this spiritual Flesh which nourishes spiritually the Faithful in respect of its outward species, consists of grains of Wheat and is made by the hands of man, that it has neither nerves, nor sinews, nor bones, nor different members, that 'tis animated with no rational soul, nor can exercise any vital functions. Whence he concludes that 'tis not then this Flesh of Jesus Christ which was born of the Virgin. In a word, the opposition therein is so formal, and so evident, that it cannot be more plain.

WHAT we have hitherto seen touching Authors Contemporary with *Paschasius*, yields us a demonstrative proof that *Paschasius* was an Innovator; for the rest do not speak like him, there are two of the famousest of 'em, viz. *Raban* and *Bertram*, who have expressly applied themselves to the refuting of his Doctrine.

TO these two we may add a third, which is *John Scot*, who wrote also by the command of *Charles the Bald* against the novelties of *Paschasius*. His Book was burnt in the Council of *Verfeil*, and we understand from the testimony of *Ascelinus* in his Letter to *Berenger*, that the end which he proposed was to shew in this Book that what is Consecrated on the Altar is neither the true Body, nor the true Blood of Jesus Christ. *Toto nisu totaque intentione ad hoc solum tendere video, ut mihi persuadeat hoc videlicet quod in Altari Consecratur neque vere Corpus, neque vere Christi Sanguinem esse, hoc autem asseruere nititur ex Sanctorum Patrum opusculis quæ prave exponit.* The Author of the Dissertation which Mr. *Arnaud* has inserted in his 12th. Book, pretends that the Book which we have under the name of *Bertram*, and that of *John Scot* are the same. He endeavours likewise to lessen as much as in him lies the authority of this Adversary to *Paschasius*, and I had not finish'd this Work without examining his Conjectures, had not one of my Friends inform'd me that he had eas'd me of this pains, as well as this Author has help'd Mr. *Arnaud*. I hope this friend of mine will soon publish his Piece, which will (or I am greatly deceived) fully satisfy every unprejudic'd man that seeks the truth.

## C H A P. XII.

*Of Personal Differences which Mr. Arnaud has treated of in his Eleventh Book.*

**H**AVING satisfied whatsoever respects the matter of this Dispute, my design wherein I am engaged of returning an exact answer to Mr. Arnaud's volume seems to require, I should now pass to the discussion of his eleventh Book which he has entituled *personal differences between the Author of the Perpetuity and me*. The interest also of my defence against Mr. Arnaud's injustices obliges me to this. Yet can I not wholly keep within this Province, for there are several reasons hindering me, which I hope judicious persons will not disallow.

FIRST, these personal differences are handled in so sharp and hot a manner, so full of animosities that 'twere better a thousand times to pass 'em over in silence, and offer 'em as a Sacrifice to Piety, Patience, and Christian Charity, than to endeavour to treat of 'em exactly, and repel Mr. Arnaud's outrages, which cannot be well done without sometimes exceeding the bounds of Christian moderation.

MOREOVER, altho I do not doubt but Mr. Arnaud and the Author of the *Perpetuity* have reason to believe that the publick will take part with what respects their persons, yet I cannot pretend 'tis the same with me. These Gentlemen have made a noise in the world, they have drawn upon 'em the expectations of all *France, Spain, and Italy*. Whereas I am a person obscure enough, and whose name is only known by my interest in this Dispute; so that 'twill be a presumption in me to believe the publick will concern it self in my respect. Should I then here begin with a long discussion of our complaints, and reciprocal defences, the readers might well say to one another that they have nothing to do with this, and that 'tis an abuse of their patience after a long discourse of things which relate to the cause, to engage them further in a tiresome discourse of Personal Differences.

IN the third place Mr. Arnaud has introduced amongst his Personal Differences several things to which 'tis impossible to answer without engaging in tedious prolixities in matters which of 'emselfes have no coherence with that of the Eucharist. I place in this rank the defence which he makes of a cruel invective of the Author of the *Perpetuity* against the first Reformers, which yet Mr. Arnaud maintains in a more fierce manner, grounding it on Facts, and Principles, some of which are false, others taken in a wrong sense, and others invidiously perverted. How can we handle in a few words so important a subject when the question concerns the justifying the innocency of several great men, and to shew at the same time the justice and necessity of our separation from the Roman Church? 'Tis plain this cannot be done in one or two Chapters, and that this is matter for a great Volume. I reduce under this head these passionate expressions which begin the 9th. Chapter of this 11th Book, and which I design to relate here, that the world may judg of 'em. *We demand justice*, says Mr. Arnaud, speaking of me, *for the excesses of which he has been guilty contrary to all rules of honesty and truth,*

truth, which even Pagans would blush to violate. We would gladly know of him whether his morals will give him this license. We are already satisfied that the Maxims of their new Divinity promise impunity to all manner of crimes, provided they be of the faithful Calvinists who commit them; and we do not question him whether he fears to be damn'd by calumniating his Adversaries. We know the solutions of his Doctors deliver him from this fear, contrary to what S. Paul says, who tells us, that slanderers shall not enter into the Kingdom of God. But that which we desire to know is, whether they have of late taken away from Crimes, the name of Crimes, and stript them of the general insamy which accompanies 'em, whether the name of a Slanderer be no longer odious amongst Calvinists, and whether they have sanctified this name, which is so horrible amongst men that they could not find a blacker, to shew their detestation of it, than to call such Devils. I design not to repel these discourses to be met with scattered throughout his whole Book, any other-wise than by reciting 'em, or at most by censuring 'em as excesses, which do not at all become a person, who pretends to correct our morals, and teach us virtue and moderation. I shall not retort upon him several things in my turn, which a just and natural defence seems to permit, and enjoyn me to tell him. But I pretend to justify so well our Morals as will make Mr. Arnaud blush for shame that he has attackt them with such an outrageous and malicious air. And this we cannot do here transiently, nor by way of answer to ten or twelve hot periods, which like lightning have more fire than matter. 'Tis necessary for this purpose to be disengaged from all other subjects; for there needs more time to remedy an evil than to do it, to cure a wound than to make it.

AND these are the reasons which withhold me from entering into an exact discussion of Mr. Arnaud's eleventh Book. But because there are in these Personal Differences some Articles which I cannot wholly pass over in silence, having too near a relation to the things which we treat of, the Readers I hope will not take it ill, if I design this whole Chapter to answer them. This Book consists either of passionate invectives against me, or defences against some of my Complaints, or accusations against me. As to the passionate expressions I concern not my self with 'em, I leave 'em to the publick judgment, and Mr. Arnaud's private conscience. It belongs to him to look whether he has form'd his stile according to the lovely idea which he himself has given us of the true Eloquence, which is, says he, *discreet, modest, judicious, sincere, true, which serves to disentangle things, and not to confound 'em, which clears truth, and offers it in such a manner as is proper to introduce it into the mind and heart, which inspires motions that are just, reasonable, proportionable to the things which we handle, which has no other lustre but what serves to discover truth, no strength but what is borrowed from her.* He will examin, I hope, at his leisure, whether he has observed all these grave characters, and whether his eagerness to overcome has not transported him sometimes into such strange convulsions as are wholly contrary to all morality and decency.

AS to his defences, I can with confidence affirm there are none of 'em which be just and warrantable; but to the end it may not be said I desire to be believed on my own bare word, let a man judg of 'em by these examples. The Author of the *Perpetuity* to prove that *Bertram* was not clearly of our opinion, alledged this reason, that *Trithemius* praised this Author. To this I answered, that he praised him *because in effect he deserved it, and that*  
this



this only increased his authority. My sense is plainly that he prais'd him because he knew his reputation was great in the 9th. Century, that his Book was therein well entertain'd, and his memory honored in the following Ages. For this is what must be understood by *being in effect praise-worthy*, and this is likewise what the terms of my answer insinuate, having added that *this only increased his authority*, which is to say, that this testimony of *Trithemus* shewed that *Bertram* was authoris'd in the Church of his time. Whereupon the Author of the *Perpetuity* concealing this true sense of my words, imputes to me another, which is that I said, *Trithemus, who believed the Real Presence, praised Bertram for opposing it*, which is a ridiculous sense, and infinitely distant from mine. This is the subject of my complaint, and here is the defence of Mr. *Arnaud*, *What is, says he, the sense of these words*, Book II. ch. 2. p. 1105, 1106. *Trithemus praised Bertram, because he was indeed praise-worthy? Do they signify that he praised him from his own knowledge, or from the opinion of others? It is clear they have only the first sense, and not the second.* All is clear which Mr. *Arnaud* speaks, but let us see how he proves it. *To commend any one from the testimony of another, is not to commend him because he is in effect praise-worthy, seeing there are several people which we do not in effect judge to be praise-worthy, altho thought worthy of praise by others. To commend a man because he is in effect worthy of commendations, is proceeding on a just and true ground, and on the reality of things, and not on reports, and popular opinions.* This is a pitiful defence, for 'tis certain there are people who are not judged to be praise-worthy altho they be praised by others: but I say that there are others which are deemed praise-worthy in effect, only because we find 'em generally commended in the Age wherein they lived, and in the following ones, without being blamed by any body. Do not most people thus believe *S. Cyprian*, *S. Hierom*, and *S. Augustin* praise-worthy, not for having read their Books, nor examin'd their Doctrins, but as knowing they were esteem'd by their own and following Ages, and that their memory was never withered in the Church? Now this is what I say, that *Trithemus* might know of *Bertram* without examining his Book, to wit, that he had the esteem of his Age, and that his memory was respected in the following ones.

IT signifies nothing for Mr. *Arnaud* to say, that I ought not to suppose without proving it that such an Author as *Trithemus*, who writes a *Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers*, and gives particular praises to an Author, does it barely from the relation of others, and that the presumption is on the contrary, that he has read his Book and speaks of it from his own proper knowledge. This I say is to no purpose, for it belongs to the Author of the *Perpetuity* that argues, and would draw a conclusion from the praises of *Trithemus*, to establish well his Principle, to prove that *Trithemus* has praised *Bertram* after he had read and examin'd his Book, *De Corpore & Sanguine Domini*, and not to me who answer, to prove that he has praised him, because he acknowledges his Fame was great in the 9th. Century. Were a man to judge hereof by presumptions, they would be rather for my supposition than for that of the Author of the *Perpetuity*; for we know very well that those who make *Catalogues of Ecclesiastical Authors* do not always take the pains to read exactly all the Books they mention. The Commendations of *Ratram*, whom we affirm to be *Bertram*, could not be unknown to *Trithemus*, and we have right to suppose that *Trithemus* has not distinguish'd *Bertram* and *Ratram* as two different persons, till the Author of the *Perpetuity* has shewed us the contrary.

Perpetuity of  
the Faith,  
sect. 2 p. 80.

Page 82.

THE second complaint whereon Mr. Arnaud endeavours to defend the Author of the *Perpetuity*, respects Mr. Blondel, whom this Author impertinently accuses to have fallen into contradiction in that he supposes on one hand that Amalarius was a Calvinist, and on the other that the Synod of Cressy, which condemned Amalarius was of the same mind; which according to the Author of the *Perpetuity* is a manifest contradiction. Observe here his words. Usher an English Protestant, supposes that Amalarius held the Doctrine of the Catholics, and therefore would have it thought that 'twas the Doctrine of the Real Presence which was condemned in Amalarius, by the Synod of Cressy, and by Florus Deacon of Lyons. And a little lower, Blondel suffering himself to be deceived by the desire which he had to raise up adversaries against Paschasus, fell on this subject into one of the most palpable contradictions imaginable: For finding on one hand advantage from Usher's opinion, who makes the whole Synod of Cressy who condemned Amalarius to consist of Calvinists, he takes this part, and supposes with him that the Council of Cressy held the Calvinists Doctrine, and were contrary to Paschasus. But finding elsewhere in the epitomized Manuscript of the Book of Divine Offices of William of Malmsbury, that Amalarius, Raban, and Heribald wrote against Paschasus, not considering that this supposition was contrary to that of Usher, he makes Amalarius again an adversary to Paschasus; so that by a manifest contradiction, he pretends that the Council which condemned Amalarius, and Amalarius who was condemned by the Council, were of one mind, and equally contrary to the Doctrine of Paschasus on the subject of the Eucharist. So far is what the Author of the *Perpetuity* says.

Answer to the  
second Treatise,  
part 3.  
ch. 1.

TO answer this accusation, I said that this pretended contradiction was a fable, That Mr. Blondel did not so much as think of Bishop Usher, and that the part which the Author of the *Perpetuity* gives to this Bishop in this adventure, was a mere Romantick whimsie. That in the main, there was no contradiction in what Mr. Blondel said; for asserting on one hand that Amalarius was censured by the Synod of Cressy for writing that the Body of Jesus Christ was triform and tripartite, and on the other that Amalarius had been one of those that contradicted the novelties of Paschasus, and in fine that he does not separate the Fathers of Cressy from the number of these Opponents, these three things were very consistent together, because it did not follow from the Synod of Cressy's condemning the triform and tripartite Body that they adopted for this all Paschasus his Fancies touching the Real Presence.

Book 11. ch. 4.  
p. 1108, 1109.

LET us now see Mr. Arnaud's defence. He assures us that what the Author of the *Perpetuity* has asserted touching Bishop Usher is a very likely conjecture; that if it be a Romantick whimsie 'tis not an impossible one. For 'tis more than probable that Blondel, who was a man of great reading, writing on a matter, was not ignorant of the opinion of a person so much esteemed by his own Party, as Bishop Usher deservedly was: that moreover 'tis a Romance that tends only to excuse Blondel, and not to criminate him; for it being certain that he has contradicted himself, 'tis always better that this has been done with some appearance of reason, as is that of following the opinion of a famous Author, than without any probability.

IS not this a mere mockery of us, or of the Author of the *Perpetuity*, to defend him after this rate? This Author relates to us as a matter of fact, that Usher believ'd such and such a thing, that Blondel finding advantage in the

the opinion of *Usher*, has taken part of it, that he has joy'd this part with what he likewise found in the Epitomy of *William of Malsbury* not considering that the one was contrary to the other. Now we demand of him where he found this fine History, seeing there appears nothing of it in *Blondel's* Book. And *Mr. Arnaud* answers that 'tis a conjecture very likely, that if it be a Romance, 'tis a Romance that is possible to be true, and one which tends to excuse *Blondel*, because 'tis better he be deceived with some pretext than without any.

LET *Mr. Arnaud* tell us, if he pleases, in what Morals he has found 'twas permitted the Author of the *Perpetuity* to pay us with his conjectures, and his possible Romances, instead of true Histories, and to tell stories at random to render *Mr. Blondel* ridiculous, because 'tis better he should be ridiculous for some reason than for none. We thank him for his Charity; but 'tis excessive, and unnecessary; for what need was there he should charge his Conscience with this pious fraud to extenuate a chimerical dishonor, seeing the pretended contradiction of *Mr. Blondel* is but a mere imagination.

SUPPOSING, says *Mr. Arnaud*, we have no other ground to prove that the Council of *Cressy* were Calvinists, but their condemning of *Amalarius*, to suppose hereupon *Amalarius* was a Calvinist, this is a contradicting of a man's self, and this is what *Blondel* does. How ill does *Mr. Arnaud* defend his Friend. 'Tis not true that *Blondel* grounded himself on what he says of the Synod of *Cressy*, in that this Synod has condemned *Amalarius*. We shall find nothing of this in his Book. And supposing he did ground himself on it, he might do it without falling into contradiction, and without giving occasion to the accusation of the Author of the *Perpetuity*; for he might draw a negative argument thence in this sense. That this Synod which could not be ignorant what was the Doctrine of *Amalarius* touching the Real Presence contented themselves with censuring in him some expressions, as that of *Corpus triforme & tripartitum*; without handling his Doctrine at bottom; which is a mark that in this respect they were agreed with him, and consequently that they rejected the Real Presence as well as *Amalarius*. Now in this case one might well dispute the force of this proof, but there is no likelihood of making a contradiction of it. But in fine to decide clearly this question, and to shew *Mr. Arnaud* how dangerous it is for a man to give himself over to too great desires of finding fault, and to decry Authors, I need only say that when *Mr. Blondel* reckons the Synod of *Cressy* amongst the number of those that have followed *Paschasius*, he does not speak of that Synod which condemned *Amalarius*, but of another that was held ten years after. In effect he formally distinguishes these two Synods, saying of one, That this conception of *Amalarius*, that the Body of *Jesus Christ* was *triform and tripartite*, was improved in the year 848. by the Council of *Cressy*; and on the other, that several contradicted *Paschasius*, as *Amalarius*, *Raban*, *Heribald*, *Bertram*, or *Ratram*. *John furnam'd Eri-*genus, from whom, says he, I do not separate *Walafridus Strabo*, Abbot of *Richeneau*, nor *Florus a Divine* of *Lyons*, nor the Body of the Bishops assembled in the year 858. at *Cressy*. These are then two different Synods, the one held in the year 848. and the other in the year 858. Of the one he says that it condemned the *Corpus triforme & tripartitum* of *Amalarius*, of the other that he does not separate them from those who contradicted *Paschasius*: what contradiction is here? Had these Gentlemen, who have faln no less than three times on this affair of *Mr. Blondel*, taken the pains

Page 1110.

Illucidations  
on the Eucha-  
rist, ch. 18.  
p. 421, 422.  
ibid. p. 427.



to read over the place of his Book here in question, they would have found what I now tell 'em touching the distinction of these Synods, and desisted from maintaining their fabulous History, and imaginary contradiction.

THESE two examples suffice to shew the weakness of Mr. Arnaud's defences. We must now come to his complaints and accusations, and discover the injustice and unreasonableness of 'em in few words, which will be no hard matter to do.

Chap. 6.

FIRST, he complains that I offered some lessening expressions in reference to the Author of the *Perpetuity* on the subject of *Bertram*, or *Ratram*, that I opposed the praises which the Author of the *Apology for the Holy Fathers* gives this person, and thereupon remark'd that these Gentlemen praise or dispraise people, raise or depress 'em, according as their interests and designs require, according as they oppose or favour their Opinions. First, Mr. Arnaud assures us that I falsified the words of the Author of the *Perpetuity*. Secondly, He says I expounded his intentions according to my own fancy. Thirdly, He will not allow I had any reason to draw from his words compared with these of the *Apology for the Holy Fathers*, the conclusion which I drew thence. We must satisfy him in these three points.

Answer to the  
second Tome,  
part 3. ch. 1.

Book 11. ch. 6.  
p. 116.

AS to the pretended falsification, observe here in what manner I related in short the discourse of the Author of the *Perpetuity*. He says that 'twas one call'd *Ratram*, or *Bertram*, an obscure and intricate Divine, who adjoynd his reasonings to the ordinary expressions of the Church, and expounded them according to his fancy, that as he was a Divine, he might argue as he pleased on this Faith, and that we can easily conceive a Divine may fall into frivolous reasonings. There needs only the reading of the Author of the *Perpetuity's* discourse to acknowledg this to be a just abridgment of it. Mr. Arnaud does not gain-say it, but he says, I charge the Author of the *Perpetuity* with calling *Bertram* a frivolous and passionate Reasoner, and for having said absolutely of him that one may well conceive that a Divine might easily fall upon frivolous reasonings, whereas he said this only conditionally, to wit, supposing 'twere granted he was effectually in an error: and this is what he calls a manifest falsity. But Mr. Arnaud complains impertinently: For I did not say that the Author of the *Perpetuity* has thus spoken of *Bertram* absolutely, and this Mr. Arnaud acknowledges, to wit, that supposing 'twere granted that *Bertram* had effectually erred, this would not at all hurt the Church, that 'tis no wonder that one man has erred, that a Divine should fall into frivolous reasonings. This I say is sufficient for my design. For what signifies this but that in case *Bertram* cannot be brought over to them and made to speak for the Real Presence, he must then be a frivolous Divine, one who has fallen into frivolous reasonings. Now this is precisely what I said, that these Gentlemen praise, or dispraise Authors according to their interests. If *Bertram* be for 'em all is well, they find no fault in him; but if it must be granted he is against 'em, then one may easily conceive that a Divine may fall into frivolous reasonings. And thus Mr. Arnaud's illustration only confirms my remark. 'Tis the same in respect of what he adds that I charge the Author of the *Perpetuity* with calling *Bertram* an obscure and intricate Divine, which is not thus set down in his Book, and that there is only that the greatest advantage which the Calvinists can pretend to touching this Author is, that he be set aside as a perplex and intricate

*tricate Author which can be profitable neither to one side nor the other.* I desire no more; for this is almost in so many words to say, that if they cannot have *Bertram* on their side, he must be put by as an obscure and intricate Divine whom both Parties endeavour to explain in their favour, but who at bottom favours neither by reason of his perplexity: If he be for them all is well, if he be not he shall be laid aside for a mystical Divine. This falsification then which Mr. *Arnaud* imputes to me is groundless, seeing he himself justifies me from it, and he confirms himself the truth of my reflection.

NEITHER has he more reason in what he says afterwards, *that I explain the intentions of others according to my own fancy, and raise up trophies to my self on imaginary conjectures.* These are angry expressions, I pretend not to dive into the intentions of the Author of the *Perpetuity*, neither do I think of raising trophies to my self at his cost. My way of proceeding is frank, natural, and simple, and if I commit faults, I can sincerely protest 'tis against my will. I have said nothing concerning the Author of the *Perpetuity*, which I have not proved, not by making conjectures on his hidden thoughts, but arguing on his Writing, which is a kind of conjecturing very lawful in disputes. Page 1117.

BUT in fine Mr. *Arnaud* will not allow I had reason in comparing the words of the Author of the *Perpetuity* touching *Bertram*, which those of the Author of the *Apology for the Holy Fathers* to draw thence the conclusion which I drew. He says *my arguing supposes that these two Authors are but one and the same person.* For if they be two different Authors, what wonder can it be they have had different sentiments on another Author. I answer, my reasoning supposes only that the Author of the *Perpetuity* is one of the friends of the Author of the *Apology*, and that what's said abroad in the world of these Gentlemen is true, that they publish nothing but what has been seen and approved of commonly amongst 'em, which being so, I had right to draw my conclusion from the comparison of the words of these two Authors, as nearly as if they were but one and the same person. Page 1118.

'TIS in vain for Mr. *Arnaud* to say *that an Author may be praise-worthy in one piece, and blameable in another.* I grant it, but I say that when one praises, or blames an Author, to raise up or depress any of his works, 'tis absurd to say that one praises him, or blames him *in this work.* for we praise or blame absolutely his person, to give hence afterwards more or less Authority to the work in question. When we depress or extol the person for the work sake, then we praise or blame a man *in his work*: but when on the contrary we depress or extol the work by the person, then his praise or blame respects absolutely the person, and then we draw this consequence, that the work in question is, or is not considerable. Now we are in this last circumstance, the Author of the *Apology* commends *Ratram* to give the greater weight to his Books of Predestination, and the Author of the *Perpetuity* depresses him to take away all authority from his Book *De Corpore & Sanguine Domini*, so that their praise and dispraise respect directly his person.

'TIS moreover in vain that Mr. *Arnaud* remarks that the Author of the *Perpetuity* did not suppose the Book which goes under the name of *Bertram* Page 1119.

was Ratram's a Religious of Corby Author of the Books of Predestination, and of the refutation of the errors of the Greeks. That seeing he testifies on the contrary to incline to the opinion of Mr. Marca, who will have this Book of Bertram and that of John Scot to be the same. That it appears at least from his Book that he had no fixt sentiment that Ratram was the Author of it. This is nothing but powder thrown into the Readers eyes; for supposing 'twere true that the Author of the *Perpetuity* were of the opinion of Mr. De Marca, which is, that this Book which bears the name of *Bertram* is *John Scot's*, and not *Ratram's*; yet 'tis certain what he says of the person of this *Bertram*, or *Ratram* (for he proves that these two names are but one and the same name) is on our supposition that 'twas the Religious of *Corby*. Whether he admits our supposition as believing it, in effect to be true, or whether he admits it merely thro condescension, 'tis needless to inquire: for supposing he admitted it only thro mere condescension, the least his words could signify will be that supposing he held our supposition to be true, which he does not, he will have these objections or reproaches to offer against the person of this Author, to wit, that he is a Divine who departs from the common belief of the Church by vain Speculations, a Divine who falls into frivolous reasonings, which suffices to justify the contradiction between him and the Author of the *Apology for the Holy Fathers*.

Mr. ARNAUD's second complaint is, that I ridicul'd the Author of the *Perpetuity* on the means he propos'd whereby to make Mr. Aubertin's Book an excellent piece, which is to change the Objections of it into Proofs, and his Proofs into Objections. Mr. Arnaud who has been touch'd to the quick with it, thought he was oblig'd to defend himself by heaping up of words, intermixing several common places of raillery, alledging instances which have no relation to the point in question, to distinguish and argue in mood and figure, and thereupon conclude with authority the sentiment of the *Perpetuity* is most just and reasonable.

WERE it worth our while 'twould be easie to shew he deceives himself in whatsoever he offers. But it being unjust to hold the Readers any longer on trifles, we shall only say, if either he, or the Author of the *Perpetuity* have been offended at a very innocent raillery, it does not follow that others have been so too. We may tell him that his way of changing Proofs into Objections, and Objections into Proofs, is a conception so rare and well express'd, that 'tis hard to hear it offer'd without finding in it matter of laughter. Moreover, there's a great deal of difference between saying that to discover the falsities of a Book, we need only to confront the passages of it with the Originals, and to say that to make of Mr. Aubertin's Book an excellent piece in the sense of the Catholics, there need only be changed the Proofs into Objections and the Objections into Proofs. The confrontation of passages, is the juster means, the most natural and most ordinary to discover falsities: but the change of Proofs into Objections, and Objections into proofs, is a kind of world turn'd upside down. We may answer him that were his pretended method receiv'd, 'twould be applicable to all sorts of Books of Controversie on either side, there being few of them but what consist of Proofs and Objections, and each Party pretending still there is more light in his Proofs than in the Proofs of his Adversary, which are called Objections. We may tell him in fine that Mr. Aubertin's Book consists not only of Proofs and Objections, but also of Instances or Replies against the ordinary Answers which are made to Proofs, and of Answers to Objections;



jections; and this is what cannot be changed, so that when a man should turn the Proofs into Objections and the Objections into Proofs, yet would he be perplexed by these instances, and answers, and consequently must acknowledge he has lost his time and pains, and that the Author of the *Perpetuity* has abused him.

Mr. ARNAUD's third complaint is an accusation couch'd under this title, *A bitter Calumny against the Author of the Perpetuity*. He proposes it in his 9th. Chapter with an impetuosity beyond example, and which shews he wrote it in the most cholerick temper imaginable. He ascends his tribunal, and thence, pronounces this sentence against me, that *I am guilty of an heinous crime, such a one as obliges me both by the Laws of God and men to publick satisfaction*. I is, says he again, a detestable calumny, an abominable crime, the most base and unjust proceeding a man can be capable of. Let not Mr. Claude marvel at these reproaches, this is no jesting matter. He must not abuse persons of Honor for to fill up a sentence. If he has express'd himself thus thro incogitancy, I cannot but affirm him to be the most imprudent man in the world, and if he has done this with mature deliberation, I must declare him one of the boldest Calumniators as ever was, and am certain there's no honest man of his Communion but will grant what I say of him and condemn this his proceeding.

I protest before God with a sincere heart, that I am in no wise concern'd at what Mr. Arnaud tells me. I have answer'd his Book, and am therewith content. But I am troubled he should spoil this Dispute, which the publick of either side might read perhaps with profit and pleasure, and having discredited it, I say, with passionate and violent expressions which cannot but disgust every man, he should moreover finish it with rash transports wholly unbecoming him. What reason has he for such a passion? I wrote these words in my Book, *God will one day shew, who they are that wrong his Church, the light of his judgment will discover all things, yea, and I hope before this comes to pass men will break thro this ignorance, and then 'twill be no longer necessary to write in favour of Transubstantiation. There will be no need of this course for a Reconciliation with Rome, and regaining peoples favour; for when the face of things shall be changed, this worlds wisdom will be useless*. Here is my crime, this the spark that has set all on fire. We understand, says he, this language, and Mr. Claude knows well enough what he has said himself, and what interpretation his words will bear. He means then the Author of the *Perpetuity* wrote not of Transubstantiation by persuasion, but out of policy, and for worldly respects. For when a Catholick Divine defends the Church to which he is united, if he believes what he says, we must not search for other reasons of his undertaking the common cause of the Church in whose truth he places his hope of Salvation deserves sufficiently to be defended. So that to charge the Author of the *Perpetuity* to write only out of political and worldly respects, is to charge him with not believing what he writes, and to give this account of it.

THIS passion is a strange thing. Had Mr. Arnaud considered these words with less heat, he would have found nothing in 'em of what he saw at first. I confess they may be understood in this sense that this affair was politically manag'd, and with respect to the obtaining the favour of the Court of Rome, and regain the peoples good will, and that this is a worldly wisdom: But 'twill not be found in 'em, That the Author of the *Perpetuity*

Ch. 9. p. 1130.

1131.

Answer to the second Treatise, part 2. ch. 3. at the end of the Chapter.

Book II. ch. 9. page 1131.

The Book entitled, *The Port Royal and Geneva of Intelligence against the most holy Sacrament of the Altar.*

Answer to the request presented to the King, &c.  
Book 2. ch. 6.  
p. 187.

*tuity did not write by persuasion, but only thro policy, as Mr. Arnaud imagin'd. This he will not find. Why then does he extend my words beyond their natural signification, and why does he wrong a man so scandalously on the imagination he said what he did not? We understand, says he, this language. He shews plainly he does not understand it, seeing he charges me with saying what I did not, and draws his Commentary only from himself, and not from my words. Had I reproach'd Mr. Arnaud with the publick Writings printed against him, wherein he is accused for formally opposing the Doctrin of Transubstantiation, and the Real Presence by a proposition to be met with in his Book of the frequent Communion? Had I told him that of late his opinion on the Eucharist has been publickly in a Letter treated as suspicious, that he has been told, That if he be unwilling, together with his friends to be of intelligence with Geneva, he must change the act of the adoration which they perform assisting at the Mass to the Elevation of the Host; for they say only, I adore thee raised on the Cross, at the general judgment, and at the right hand of the Father, without any mention of adoring him being present in the Church. Had I severely applied my self to what he says somewhere in his Book, on the Principles of Des Cartes his Philosophy, That God sees in the matter, in the figures and forms only a different order of parts, to conclude thence that this proposition overthrows the existence of accidents without a subject in the Eucharist, and consequently that 'tis contrary to the common Doctrin of the Church of Rome, as it has been observ'd in a Letter Printed not long since, what tempests must I not have expected, seeing for having only hinted that there might be some policy in the Author of the Perpetuity's works I have raised such a great disturbance?*

Book 11. ch. 9.  
p. 1132.

Mr. ARNAUD protests *he will never for my sake dispense with the rules of Justice, that he will never devine my secret intentions.* Let him not then pretend to read in my heart, nor attribute to me a mystical sense which I never intended, nor is contained in my words. All those that believe Transubstantiation are not in a capacity of writing in its favour. Amongst those that are, how many do betake themselves to other matters? Is it not then a very likely matter that a person who is at liberty to write on any subject, but pitches upon Transubstantiation, is it not, I say, very likely his choice of this point is grounded on some worldly policy and carnal considerations? In attributing this to him we do nothing but what is very just and innocent. And this is all that my words signifie, to pretend to know more of my mind, is to attempt a thing which is possible only to God, and yet this Mr. Arnaud would do, that he might have some colour for his passion.

Mr. ARNAUD I hope will suffer me likewise to tell him that what I said touching some words of the Author of the *Perpetuity*, which I believed were not very advantageous to the common mysteries of our Religion, do neither respect his person nor the main of his sentiments which I never pretended to handle, but only his expressions which I judged, and still do judg to be too rough and vehement on points to which we cannot shew enough respect. We ought all of us to be very circumspect in our ways of speaking, to give no occasion to the open enemies of the Gospel truths which we joynly profess. This is my opinion, and my words will not admit fairly of any other explication. Can Mr. Arnaud wonder we should be offended to hear these questions, *Why are the immortality of*

the

*the soul, and everlasting bliss so hidden, and as it were so buried in the Books of the Old Testament which are receiv'd into the Canon of the Jews? Why did not Jesus Christ declare his Divinity in such clear and precise terms that 'twere impossible to elude them? What may the Pagans say on what the Church teaches concerning Original Sin, and this inconceivable transmission of a crime, which is a spiritual and voluntary action, to all the Sons of him that committed it, altho they could not have any part in his action, and of this dreadful condemnation of all humane nature for the fault of one man? Can he think it strange we have been troubled to hear the difficulties which the mystery of the Trinity contains called dreadful difficulties, and to find 'em exaggerated in this manner: Were a man in this point to be guided by his reason, he must needs start back at these inconceivable verities. Should he pretend to make use of its lights to penetrate them, she will only furnish him with arms to combat them. Who can but be offended at the propositions which are in this last work of Mr. Arnaud on the subject of proofs which I alledged out of the Holy Scripture for the Trinity. That this will be very rational in the mouth of a Catholick, because he accompanies these proofs with the publick intelligence of the whole Church and of all tradition. But that these same proofs are infinitely weak in the mouth of a Calvinist without authority, without possession, and who renounces Tradition and the Churches Authority. That Mr. Claude, (who alledges the best part of what there is in the Scripture concerning the Trinity and Divinity of Jesus Christ) overthrows the Socinians beyond all remedy, yet in such a manner as is more likely to make 'em laugh than to convert 'em. I do not believe these questions or propositions are justifiable, take 'em how we will; but supposing they were, it must be granted they are conceiv'd in such rough, dangerous, and excessive terms, that 'tis for the publick edification to avoid 'em, yea and to censure 'em.*

Perpetuity of  
the Faith re-  
sured, part 1.

Book 10. ch. 6.  
p. 1042.

Page 1043.

BUT in fine, we must leave these Personal Differences which cannot but be displeasing. And therefore we will come to the Preface of my Answer to Father *Nüet*, which seems to have much incensed Mr. *Arnaud*, and seeing he seems to be much concerned at it, we will endeavour to satisfy him about it. What then does this Preface contain which is so troublesome and grievous? I confess we have mention'd a matter of fact in it wherein these Gentlemen have been concern'd; to wit, that their Book was refused an Approbation: but this was a point which shew'd the reason why this Answer was publish'd against Father *Nüet*, a fact moreover that was true and known by every body. We have drawn thence a consequence which was not advantageous to Mr. *Arnaud*, 'tis true; but a consequence which is very natural: for that Gentleman whose approbation was sought for to this last work of Mr. *Arnaud*, and who refused it, is a publick person who gives not his Approbations as a private man, but as holding a rank and very considerable employ in one of the most famous Universities in Europe. If the face of things has been since altered, Mr. *Arnaud* knows the reason of it; and we too. We have used some expressions of raillery, and this perhaps has most troubled Mr. *Arnaud*; but who ever told him that raillery ought to be wholly banish'd from a Dispute. Not to fetch examples elsewhere, we know very well that these Gentlemen have oft used it in their Writings, and not without success; and not to go further, Mr. *Arnaud* himself has not abstain'd from it in this last Book he wrote against me. I do not take it ill, for I had rather at any time see him merry than angry.



Chap. 11.  
p. 1162.

I complain'd in this Preface of my being brought in impertinently into the *abuses and nullities* against the order of the Arch-Bishop of *Paris*. But I believe 'twill be now acknowledg'd that I had reason to admire what was said therein of me, in charging me with *inconceivable boldness* in denying the most evident *matters, and maintaining the most false ones*. This has occasion'd my making a more general complaint, which is, that these Gentlemen omit no occasion of testifying their aversion to us in a very sharp and severe manner, and many times without any pretence or cause. To say hereupon, as Mr. *Arnaud* does, that they never speak otherwise than *truly and justly, and herein only observe the Principles of their Religion*, this is to testify further his passion, and assert a thing the least favourable imaginable to the Church of *Rome*. For here the question is not concerning the main of our Controversies, nor whether we have reason or not. This is a matter which we do not pretend to meddle with in a Preface, and when this shall be the point we shall be able to shew that 'tis neither with truth, nor reason that these Gentlemen speak of us as they do. The question here is touching the manner after which they speak, ever rending us with injurious expressions? To say that 'tis their Religion which inspires them with these motions, and persuades them this way of proceeding is just and reasonable, is to impute to their Religion a thing which will render it odious, and of which I believe 'tis no wise guilty; for how many persons do we see who are no less Roman Catholicks than these Gentlemen, who speak and write as well as they, and yet do not use their way of proceeding. If I have attributed their affected animosity to the desire they have of freeing themselves from all suspicions that they held intelligence with us, what is there in all this which may justly offend them. Have not these suspicions been made publick, and have we not seen Books Printed whose Titles declared more than bare suspicions? This is a thing which I did not invent at leisure, neither one of *my conjectures, nor a possible Romance*, nor a particular secret which I have imprudently divulged, but a matter of fact which others besides my self have publish'd, and which is known by every body. Is Mr. *Arnaud* offended at my imputing to him the desire of clearing himself from this suspicion? I wish with all my heart this were the occasion of his wrath, neither would I complain in this case, to be its sacrifice. But I am afraid that in turning things on this side, I shall pull on my self a new quarrel more terrible than the first. What reason has he then to be angry? We are the only sufferers in all this, we suffer in the suspicion, we suffer in the justification, we suffer in the manner of the justification. But God give us grace to suffer patiently, and we hope he will not refuse us that of persevering in our duty to him, and pursuing to the last *truth with love*, till we arrive at his Kingdom, where we shall find rest after our labors, and where our reproach will be turn'd into glory.

AND here I shall finish this Chapter and Book, and intreat Mr. *Arnaud* not to take any thing ill which I have said to him, and to consider that I maintain my Cause, a Cause of whose Goodness and Justice I cannot in the least doubt. Let him not think I have been set on work by a spirit of contention, I naturally hate it, and several persons of Honor and Probity know I engaged in this Controversie much against my will, my temper inclining me rather to live retired and quiet. Neither let him think I thought of diminishing in any sort the Reputation which he has acquired in the world. I take it as a great honor to be found in the lists with him; and as

to

to his person, whatsoever sharpness he has used towards me, he shall always find me respecting his ingenious qualifications. If he be displeased to find himself deceived in the great hopes which he conceiv'd touching the Greeks, Armenians, and other Eastern Churches, this will shew him he must not always judg of things from their first appearances. That which deceived him is, that he has taken for the true Greek Church a Party of Greeks which has been a long time a forming and which the rest call *ἡγεμονόφρονες*, which is to say, those who are in their hearts and opinions Latins, altho outwardly professors of the Greek Rites, and live amongst the rest in the same Communion. 'Twas this Party who for so long a time opposed *Meletus* the Patriarch of *Alexandria*, and *Cyril* his Successor, afterwards Patriarch of *Constantinople*, and who in fine o'whelm'd *Cyril* by the assistance of the Court of *Rome*, as I have elsewhere said that *Allatus* himself has acknowledged, and as I proved in the 12th. Chapter of the said Book. Since this great Victory which was follow'd by the promotion of *Cyril* of *Beroe* the Jesuits Disciple, and a great favorer of the Latins, to the Patriarchate of *Constantinople*, I do not doubt but this Party has mightily strengthen'd itself, and that several amongst 'em have declared themselves more loudly and openly than they did before. In effect 'twas about this time that a certain Greek of this Party called *Meletus Syrigus* wrote a Catechism which was sign'd in the two pretended condemnations of *Cyril Lucar*, the one under *Cyril* of *Beroe*, and the other under *Parthenius*, with this Title *ορθόδοξος ὁμολογία τῆς καθολικῆς καὶ ἀποστολικῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς ἀνατολικῆς*, which is to say, *An Orthodox Confession of the Catholick Apostolical and Eastern Church*, in which he asserts the conversion of the substances of Bread and Wine into those of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, with the subsistence of accidents without a subject, and uses the very term of *μετεσώσις*. If Mr. *Arnaud* has meant by the Greek Church the persons of that Party, I have already declared to him, and again tell him that I have not disputed against him. We do not pretend to dispute the Conquests of the Missions and Seminaries, let him peaceably enjoy 'em, we mean only the true Greeks, who retain the Doctrin and ancient expressions of their Church. And as to those, we are certain of two things, the one that they hold not the Transubstantiation of the Latins, which I believe I have clearly proved; and the other that they alone ought to be called the true Greek Church, altho the contrary Party were the most prevalent, and possessed the Patriarchates. Mr. *Arnaud* himself has told us that these Seats are disposed of by the sovereign authority of the Turks to those that have most money, and we know moreover the great care that has been taken to establish the Roman Doctrins in these Countries, thro the Neglect and Ignorance of the Prelates, Monks, and People, whether by instructing their Children, or gaining the Bishops, or filling the Churches with the Scholars of Seminaries, and other like means which I have describ'd at large in my second Book. Mr. *Arnaud* perhaps will answer that he likewise maintains on his side, that this Party which teaches Transubstantiation is the true Greek Church, and the other but a Cabal of *Cyril's* Disciples. I answer, that to decide this question, we need only examin which of these two Parties retains the Doctrin and Expressions of the ancient Greeks; for that which has this Character must be esteem'd the true Greek Church, and not that which has receiv'd novelties unknown to their Fathers. Now we have clearly shew'd that the conversion of Substances, Transubstantiation, and the Real Presence, are Doctrins and Expressions, of which the Greeks of former Ages have had no knowledg; whence it follows that the Party which

admits these Doctrins and Expressions, are a parcel of Innovators which must not be regarded as if they were the true Greek Church. Let Mr. *Arnaud*, and those who read this Dispute, always remember that the first Proposition of the Author of the *Perpetuity* is that in the 11th. Century at the time of *Berenger's* condemnation, the Greeks held the Real Presence and Transubstantiation, that this is the time which he chose, and term'd his fix'd point, to prove from hence that these Doctrins were of the first establishment of Religion; and consequently perpetual in the Church. Which I desire may be carefully observed to prevent another illusion, which may be offered us, by transterring the question of the Greeks of that time to the Greeks at this, and to hinder Mr. *Arnaud* and others from triumphing over us when it shall happen that the Missions and Seminaries, and all the rest of the intrigues which are made use of shall devour the whole Land of *Greece*. For in this case the advantage drawn hence against us will be of no value; 'twill neither hence follow, that the Doctrins in question have been perplex'd in the Church, nor that the Greek Church held 'em in the time of *Berenger's* condemnation; and what I say touching the Greeks, I say likewise touching the other Eastern Churches over which the Roman Church extends its Missions and Care as well as the Greeks.

AS to what remains, let not Mr. *Arnaud* be offended that in the refutation of his Book in general, I have every where shewed the little justice and solidity of his reasonings, and especially in the refutation of his first, sixth, and tenth Book. I acknowledg he has wrote with much Wit, Elegancy, and polite Language, and attribute to the defect of his subject, whatsoever I have noted, to be amiss, either in his Proofs, or Answers: but 'tis very true, the world never saw so many illusions and such great weakness, in a work of this nature; and all that I could do was to use great condescensions, in following him every where to set him strait. I have only now to beseech Almighty God to bless this my Labor, and as he has given me Grace to undertake and finish it, so he will make it turn to his Glory and the Churches Edification. *A M E N.*

---

AN



A N  
ANSWER  
TO THE  
DISSERTATION

Which is at the end of

Mr. Arnaud's Book,  
Touching the Book of the  
**Body and Blood of our Lord,**

Publish'd under the name of *BERTRAM*,

AND OF THE

Authority of *John Scot*, or *Erigenus*.

---

---



---

---

L O N D O N :

Printed by *M. C.* for *Richard Royston*, Bookseller  
to the King's most Excellent Majesty. 1683.

ANSWER

TO THE

DISSEMINATION

Which is at the end of

Mr. Alford's Book

entitled the Book of the

Scriptures and Blood of our Lord

and of the

Authorship of the New Testament



Printed by J. Alford, at the British Museum, 1835.

# Advertisement.

**T**HOSE that shall cast their eyes on this Answer, will be at first apt to think these Critical Questions belong only to Scholars. Whereas we have here several important matters of fact, which are in a manner necessary to the full understanding of the Controversie of the Eucharist. The Church of Rome pretends we have forsaken the Ancient Faith, and that Berenger was one of the first who taught our Doctrin in the beginning of the 11th. Century. We on the contrary maintain 'tis the Roman Church that has departed from the Ancient Belief; and that 'twas Paschasius Ratbert, who in the beginning of the 9th. Century taught the Real Presence, and the Substantial Conversion. And to this in short may be reduced the whole Controversie which was between Mr. Claude and Mr. Arnaud.

Mr. Claude has strenuously and clearly shewed that as many Authors as were of any Repute in the 9th. Century, have opposed the Doctrin of Paschasius; and that consequently Paschasius must be respected as a real Innovator. Now amongst these Writers, Mr. Claude produces John Scot, or Erigenus, and Bertram, or Ratram a Religious of Corby, two of the greatest Personages of that Age, and shews they wrote both of 'em against the Novelties which Paschasius had broach'd; that one of 'em Dedicated his Book to Charles the Bald, King of France, and the other likewise wrote his by the same King's Order. That the first having lived some time in this Prince's Court, died at last in England in great reputation for his holiness of Life; that the other was always esteem'd and revered as the Defender of the Church, which seems to be decisive in our favour.

Mr. Arnaud on his side, finding himself toucht to the quick by the consequence of these Proofs, has used his last and greatest Endeavours to overthrow or weaken 'em. And for this purpose has publish'd at the end of his Book two Dissertations, the one under his own name, and the other under the name of a Religious of St. Genevieve, whose name is not mention'd. In the first, which is under the name of the Religious, he does two things; for first, he endeavours to persuade that the Book of the Body and Blood of our Lord is not in effect Ratram's, but John Scot's: And in the second place he endeavours to decry John Scot, and deprive him of all Esteem and Authority. In the other Dissertation, Mr. Arnaud pretends that whosoever was the Author of this Book, Mr. Claude has not rightly comprehended the sense of it, and that this Book does not combat the Doctrin of Paschasius. And thus Mr. Arnaud pretends



## Advertisement.

pretends to discharge himself of Mr. Claude's proof, so that to take away from him this last subterfuge, and re-establish this part of Mr. Claude's proof, it is necessary to shew clearly that the little Book of our Lords Body and Blood, is in effect Ratram's, and that this Book is directly opposite to the Doctrin of Paschasus, and that John Scot is an Author whose Testimony is of great weight and authority: which is what I have undertaken to do in this Answer: And I hope these kind of Elucidations will not be deemed unprofitable, or unpleasant. Moreover, I did not think my self oblig'd to enter into a particular Examination of the second Dissertation touching Bertram's Book, because the History which I make of this Book, the judgment which those of the Church of Rome have made of it at several times, with what Mr. Claude alleges concerning it in the 11th. Chapter of his sixth Book, are sufficient to shew clearly that this Author has directly combated the Doctrin of Paschasus, without offering to tire the Readers with troublesome repetitions. Moreover, we hope to give the Publick in a short time a translation of Bertram's Book, which being but a small Treatise, requires only an hours reading, in which every one may see with their own eyes what's his true sense, without a more tedious search after it in Mr. Arnaud's Arguments, or mine.

AN

A N  
A N S W E R  
T O T H E  
D I S S E R T A T I O N

Which is at the end of

Mr. Arnaud's Book,

Touching the Treatise of *Our Lords Body and Blood*;  
Publish'd under the name of *Bertram*, and touch-  
ing the Authority of *John Scot*, or *Erigenus*.

THE FIRST PART.

Wherein is shew'd that the Book of *the Body and  
Blood of our Lord*, Publish'd under the name of  
*Bertram* is a work of *Ratram* a Monk of *Corbie*,  
and not of *John Scot*.

C H A P. I.

*An Account of the several Opinions which the Doctors of the Roman  
Church have offered touching this Book, to hinder the advantage  
which we draw from it.*

**T**HE Book of *Bertram*, of *the Body and Blood of our Lord* ha-  
ving been Printed at *Cologne* in the year 1532. the Doctors of  
the Roman Church have judg'd it so little favourable to 'em,  
that they have thought themselves necessitated to deprive it of  
all its authority, and to cry it down either as an Heretical Book, or a for-  
ged piece, or at least as a Book corrupted by the Protestants.

I N

Book 1. of  
Euch. c. 1.  
Indic. Quirog.  
Ind. Clem. VIII.  
Indic. Sandoz.  
An. 1612.  
Prefat. in Bibl.  
Sandoz.

IN the year 1559. those that were employed by the Council of *Trent* for the examining of Books, placed this in the rank of Heretical Authors of the first Classis; the reading of which ought to be forbidden. Their judgment was publish'd by *Pius IV.* and follow'd by Cardinal *Bellarmin* and *Quiroga*, and by Pope *Clement VIII.* and Cardinal *Sandoz*.

*SIXTUS* of *Sienna* treats this Book no better in 1566. he tells us 'tis a pernicious piece, wrote by *Oecolampadus*, and publish'd by his Disciples under the name of *Bertram*, (an Orthodox Author) to make it the better received. *Possevin* the Jesuit, and some others, followed the opinion of *Sixtus*, and carried on the same accusation against the Authors of the impression of this Book.

Proleg in appar.

Joan. Rossus.  
proleg. in 4. lib.  
adv. Oecolamp.  
Artic. 2.

BUT besides that the Bishop of *Rochester* cited it against *Oecolampadus* himself in the year 1526. which is to say, six years before 'twas Printed, the several Manuscripts which have been since found in Libraries, have shewed that this accusation was unjust and rash, which has obliged the Author of the *Dissertation* (which I examin) to leave it, and confess, that this impression was true.

Indic. Belgic.  
vocat Bertramus.

IT was without doubt from the same reason that in 1571. the Divines of *Doway* took another course than that of the entire proscription of the Book; Altho, say they, we do not much esteem this Book, nor would be troubled were it wholly lost; but seeing it has been several times Printed, and many have read it, and its name is become famous by the Prohibition which has been made of it, the Hereticks knowing it has been prohibited by several Catalogues, that moreover its Author was a Catholick Priest, a Religious of the Convent of *Corbie*, beloved and considered not by *Charlemain*, but by *Charles the Bald*, That this Writing serves for an History of all that time, and that moreover we suffer in ancient Catholick Authors several Errors, extenuating them, excusing them, yea often denying 'em by some tergiversation invented expressly, or giving them a commodious sense when they are urged against us in Disputes which we have with our Adversaries, we therefore see no reason why *Bertram* should not deserve the same kindness from us, and why we should not review and correct him, cur non eandem recognitionem mereatur *Bertramus*, lest the Hereticks should scoffingly tell us we smother Antiquity, and prohibit enquiries into it, when 'tis on their side; and therefore we ought not to be troubled that there seems to be some small matters which favor them, seeing we Catholicks handle Antiquity with so little respect, and destroy Books as soon as ever they appear contrary to us. We ought likewise to fear lest the Prohibition which has been made of this Book, should cause its being read with greater greediness, not only by Hereticks, but also by disobedient Catholicks, that it be not alledged in a more odious fashion, and in fine, do more hurt by its being prohibited than if 'twere permitted.

THUS do the Divines of *Doway* ingeniously declare their opinion how Books ought to be dealt with, that do not favour their belief. They would not have *Bertram's* Book prohibited, but corrected.

Lib. 1. de Pref.  
Chr. in Euch.  
c. 2. p. 10.

GREGORY of *Valence* and *Nicholas Romæus* follow the sentiment of the *Doway* Divines, but this expedient is become wholly impossible since there have been several Manuscripts found in places unsuspected, and that these



these Manuscripts appear wholly conformable to the Prints, as we are inform'd by Cardinal Perron and several others after him. Thus the Doctors of the Roman Communion finding 'em selves fals not only from their hopes of making the world believe this was a false piece, but also of persuading 'em 'twas corrupted, have been forced to have recourse to fresh Councils to elude the advantage we make of it.

*In Calvini ref. specl. 3. Col. 21. & Specl. 8. col. 72. Book 2. of Euch. Auth. 39. p. 666. and Usher de success. Eccl. c. 2. p. 41.*

THE President *Mauguin* seeing then on one hand the Book could not be denied to be true, and, acknowledging moreover that this *Bertram* to whom 'tis attributed, is no other than *Ratramnus* whom he lately mention'd with such great Elogies, as being the defender of the Doctrin of the Church concerning Divine Grace, he, I say, believ'd 'twas best to attempt the justifying him by any means from the crime of Heresie touching the Eucharist. And for this effect has bethought himself of maintaining that *Ratramnus* in the Book in question, defends the same Doctrin which *Paschasius Ratbert* defended in that which he wrote on the same subject; that both one and the other, to wit, *Ratramnus* and *Paschasius* had to deal with the same Hereticks, to wit, certain Stercoranists (who according to Cardinal Perron, appeared in the 9th. Century) that they both of 'em admirably well agree in defending the Catholick Church; so that there can be no charge of Heresie brought against *Bertram*, as they of his Communion had hitherto done without any reason.

*Dissert. Hist. c. 17. p. 134, 135.*

Mr. *HERMAN* Canon of *Beauvais* has approved of this sentiment of Mr. *Mauguin* in a Letter to Mr. *De St. Beuve*, Printed in 1652. under the name of *Hierom ab Angelo forti*; and 'tis by this means he endeavours to defend *Jansenius* his Disciples against Mr. *Desmarets*, Professor in Divinity at *Groningue*, who argued against Transubstantiation from the authority of this same *Ratramnus*, whom the Gentlemen of the *Port Royal* quoted as one of the most famous Witnesses of the Belief of the Church against the novelties of *Molina*.

IT seems also that Mr. *De St. Beuve* does not disapprove of this opinion of Mr. *Mauguin* and Mr. *Herman* in his Manuscript Treatise of the Eucharist, as we may collect from the Preface of *D' Luc d' Achery*, on the second Tome of his *Spicilege*. Yet by a strange kind of injustice after the testimony of Cardinal *Du Perron*, and others who have seen *Bertram's* Manuscript, he still suspects it to have suffered some alteration. Howsoever he would have us remember that *Ratramnus* died in the bosom of the Church, and bear with his offensive expressions. This is the part which these two Gentlemen have taken for the preservation of *Ratramnus* his authority, whose testimony is useful to 'em in other matters.

*CELLOT* the Jesuit on the contrary, designing in his History of *Gottcheschale*, and in his Appendixes, to oppose the sentiments of Mr. *Mauguin* in the subject of Grace, and to discredit its Champions, has attackt the person of *Ratramnus*. He does indeed acknowledg him for the true Author of the Book of the Body and Blood of our Lord, but he does all that he is able to discredit it, and bereave it of all the Authority which these other Gentlemen attribute to it. Howsoever, he yields it to the Protestants as being for them, and maintains with *Possévin*, that altho this Book may be read with corrections, yet Pope *Clement VIII.* has done well in prohibiting it.

OTHERS of better judgments in the Romish Communion have clearly foreseen that if what *Cellot* the Jesuit offers against *Ratramnus* is of use to him against the Disciples of *Jansenius*, and if his way of proceeding be advantageous against the Adversaries which he had at his back, 'twas not the same in respect of us. For as fast as he deprived his Adversaries of so famous an Author as *Ratramnus*, in decrying him for an Heretick on the subject of the Eucharist, he yielded him to us without any dispute, and by this means does himself furnish us with a very authentick Author against Transubstantiation and the Real Presence. They have believed then that to prevent the falling into this inconveniency, they must invent some other new means, which on one hand might be less bold, and more likely than is that of Mr. *Manguin*, which cannot reasonably be maintain'd, and which on the other would not give us so great advantage as Father *Cellot* has given us in placing *Ratramnus* absolutely on our side.

AND this is what Mr. *Marca* the deceased Arch-Bishop of *Paris* has seem'd to have done, when he offered as a new discovery that the Book in question is of *John Scot*, or *Erigenus*. For by means of this opinion he pretended to secure to *Ratramnus* his whole authority and reputation, and attribute at the same time to the Book of the *Body and Blood of our Lord*, the infamy of an heretical piece, according to the Decree of the Roman Censurers. We may charge Mr. *De Marca* with inconstancy, seeing that in his French Treatise of the Eucharist, which was publish'd since his death by the Abbot *Faget* his Cousin-german, he acknowledged that *Bertram* and *Ratram* were but one and the same Author, and that the Book of the *Body and Blood of our Lord* is truly of *Ratramnus*.

Tome 2.  
Spicil.

HOWSOEVER Mr. *De Marca* affirms in his Letter to *De Luc d'Achery*, wrote in 1657. First, That the Book of the *Body and Blood of our Lord* is not of *Ratramnus*, as the learned have thought. Secondly, That 'tis *John's*, surnamed *Scot*, or *Erigenus*. Thirdly, That *John Scot* acknowledging this Book was contrary to the Doctrin of the Church, publish'd it under the name of *Ratramnus*, by a famous Imposture, to give it the more weight. Fourthly, That this Book is then the same which was condemned in the Council of *Verfeile* by *Leo IX.* as *Lanfranc* reports, and was at length burnt in the Council of *Rome* under *Nicholas II.* in 1059. And thus does he reject his former opinion thro human weakness, from which the greatest Wits are not exempt, and wherein a man easily falls when 'tis his interest to be of another mind.

Mr. *De Marca* well perceiv'd what a troublesom thing it was to the Roman Faith, to say that *Paschasus*, which is, as it were, the head of it, according to the Hypothesis of the Protestants, was opposed by all the learned and famous men which were then in the Church. He also well foresaw that those who would reflect on the person of *Ratram*, would be extremely surpriz'd to see that upon the contests to which the Doctrin of *Paschasus* gave birth, *Charles the Bald* having consulted *Ratram*, this great man took part with *Paschasus* his Adversaries. He knew likewise that 'twas this same *Ratram*, who was consulted on the subject of Grace by the same *Charles the Bald*, and who shew'd himself so zealous for the truth, that he feared not to withstand three times *Hincmar* his Arch-Bishop, as Mr. *Manguin* has observ'd, That this *Ratram* was so famous in his time, that after these bick-

erings

erings with *Hincmar*, *Hincmar* himself and the other French Prelates, commission'd him to answer in their name the objections of the Greeks in the dispute which arose between them and the Latins. There was no likelihood of making such a one pass for an Heretick. Moreover, Mr. *Marca* could not deny but that the Book of our *Lords Body and Blood* ought to be attributed to *Ratram*, should we refer our selves to the testimony of *Sigebert*. He himself calls it *the little Book published by the Protestants, under the name of Bertram, and attributed to Ratram by Sigebert and Trithemius*. He believed likewise he had gotten a certain proof that since the 9th. Century this Book bore the title of *Ratram*, because the anonymous Author publish'd by *Cellot*, reckons *Ratram* one of *Paschasus's* Adversaries. And Mr. *De Marca* took this anonymous Author for an Author of the 9th. Century, as *Perron* also thought. What remedy is there to these inconveniencies which appear to be of so great consequence? For, for to take the part of Mr. *Mauguin*, and to say that the Book in question contains nothing but what is conformable to the belief of the Roman Church, is even according to him an unwarrantable assertion.

*Epist. ad De  
Luc & Ach.  
T. 2. Spicil.*

TO extricate himself out of these perplexities, Mr. *Marca* believ'd it best to maintain that *John Scot* was the true Author of this Book, that 'twas *John Scot* himself that fathered it on *Ratram*, and that *Cellot's* anonymous Author being ignorant of this fact was deceived in what he wrote of it. And this is the happy invention by which Mr. *De Marca* thought he might procure great advantages to his Party. First, He reduces both *Paschasus* his Adversaries to one, which already diminishes the number of 'em. Secondly, He delivers *Paschasus* from the hands of an adversary who was constantly held for a most Orthodox Divine in his time. Thirdly, By this means he decries this Book it self by attributing it to an Author, who in the 9th. Century drew on himself some Censures from the Councils of *Valence* and *Langres* touching the questions of Grace, and whom the Roman Church condemned in the 11th. at *Verceil*, and at *Rome* on the matter of the Eucharist. Fourthly, He discharges his Church of the reproach of having condemned in the 11th. Century, and still at this day condemning a Doctrine which was taught in the 9th. by an Orthodox Author, such as was *Ratram*. Again, the name of *John Scot* has appeared to him very proper for the giving some colour to his discovery, because that in effect *John Scot* wrote likewise a Book on the subject of the Eucharist which he dedicated to *Charles the Bald*, and that this Book is lost, whether by chance or on purpose, as it has also hapned to others, we cannot guess.

WE may with great likelihood say that Mr. *Arnaud* and his friends have had the same interests as Mr. *De Marca*. But we may also add that they have had a particular reason which much contributes to make 'em embrace Mr. *De Marca's* opinion, and maintain with him that *Ratram* is not the Author of the Book in question, but *John Scot*, or *Erigenus*. Mr. *Claude* has shewed them in the famous Dispute which they have had, that having once esteemed *Ratram* for the Oracle of his time, and for the great defender of the Orthodox Doctrine of Divine Grace, 'tis not fair to refuse his testimony now on the Eucharist, and treat him as an Author of small importance, that this is an exposing of a man's self plainly to the reproach of injustice and lightness. They must then deliver themselves at any rate from the importunity of this Book, and absolutely deny that 'tis *Ratram's*. But the way to do it handsomely is difficult, seeing the Author of the *Perpetuity* seems to

*Answer to the  
Perpetuity,  
Part 3. ch. 1.*



have acknowledg'd that *Bertram* and *Ratram* were but one and the same person, and that he was the real Author of the Book in question. To get out of this vexatious suit, a Religious of *S. Genevieve*, whose name is not mention'd, opportunely offers himself. He sends a Dissertation touching *John Scot* and *Bertram*, wherein he makes a third Party between *Mr. De Marca* and the Author of the *Perpetuity*, to wit, that the Book is *John Scot's*; but an obscure and perplex'd piece. *Mr. Arnaud* adopts this Dissertation, and publishes it at the end of his Book. So that properly neither the Author of the *Perpetuity* retracts, nor *Mr. Arnaud* who contradicts him; but an anonymous Religious who gives us his conjectures. And by this means all is made whole again, and the Confession which the Author of the *Perpetuity* has made is no more at farthest than the error of one man.

## C H A P. II.

*That what the Author of the Dissertation would reform in the Opinion of Mr. De Marca, does not at all make it the more probable.*

**T**HAT which the Author of the *Dissertation* has changed in the conjecture of *Monfieur De Marca*, to make it a little more tolerable, may be reduced to these three things. First, He will have the supposition of this Book to be made, not by *John Scot* himself in the 9th. Century, as *Mr. De Marca* says, but by *Berenger*, or those of his Party towards the end of the 11th. Secondly, He pretends that in respect of the Title, the supposition has not been made barely under the name of *Ratram*; but that those who have made the change have made the Book pass under the name of *Bertram*, or that of *Bertramnus*, or under that of *Ratram*, or *Intram*, or *Ratramnus*, or perhaps under several of these different names, but indifferent Copies. Thirdly, He will have it to be in respect of the sense of the Book but an obscure and perplex'd piece, whereas *Mr. De Marca* openly acknowledges it to be heretical, incapable of a good explication, and justly censured.

**B**UT we cannot conceive how *Mr. De Marca's* conjecture will appear more probable by these new corrections. In effect if it be unjust in *Mr. De Marca* to accuse without proof, witnesses, or ground, and even without any probability *John Scot* of an imposture so great as this is, what judgment must we make of the accusation which *Mr. Arnaud* brings under the name of the Author of the *Dissertation*, against *Berenger* or his followers? Who has revealed to him the mystery of this supposition which he so historically deals out to us? Where are the Adversaries of *Berenger* who have reproached him with this deceit, or those of his Party? Where are the Manuscripts which help him to this discovery? 'Tis apparent there needs a great stock of confidence to form accusations of this consequence without any proof. For my part I may accuse the Disciples of *Paschasus* with more likelihood for having attributed their Masters Books to names of far greater renown than his. Whilst I write this, I have before me the Treatise of the *Perpetual Virginity of the Holy Virgin*, of which in fine we know *Paschasus* to be the Author. Yet has this Book passed hitherto for *S. Hildephonsus's*, Arch-Bishop of *Toledo*; and in a Manuscript which I have by me, it appears that this supposition is made designedly by a Priest of the 10th. Century, named

named *Gomezan*, who pretends that this Book was brought from *Spain* by a Bishop called *Gotifcalc*: and this good man has carried on the supposition so far as to corrupt the Catalogue of *S. Hildephonsus* his works, by inserting in 'em these words which are to be found in the Edition of *Miræus* as well as in the Manuscript. *He wrote—a little Book of the Virginity of the Holy Virgin, against three Infidels.* We know likewise that *Paschasius* his Book touching the Eucharist, was father'd on the famous *Raban*, as appears from the *Cologne* Edition in 1551. and from the Manuscripts of which the Author of the *Dissertation* says he has another of 'em in his hands; altho it be certain that *Paschasius* is the Author of this Book, and that *Raban* was of a contrary opinion to *Paschasius*. But without such appearance, and without any ground, proof, or Witnesses, we must be gravely told, that *Berenger* or his Disciples, who were not convinced nor accused of any such thing, have fathered on *Bertram* the Book which was condemned at *Verseil* and *Rome*, and which is in effect *John Scot's*, and that six hundred years after we must be informed of this pretended supposition, which no body before ever imagin'd: what is this but imposing on the Readers credulity.

THE second change which the Author of the *Dissertation* makes of Mr. *De Marca's* sentiment is a mere cavil that has no foundation, as I shall shew hereafter. In effect Mr. *De Marca* as well before as since his new conjecture, has acknowledg'd that *Bertram* and *Ratram* are but one and the same.

AND as to what that Author imagins in the third place that Mr. *De Marca* was mistaken in his maintaining that *Bertram's* Book is plainly against Transubstantiation, and the Real Presence; whereas it ought only to pass for an obscure and perplex'd Writing, 'tis evident this was to save the Author of the *Perpetuity's* reputation. In effect if he had not this consideration, how could he content himself with barely treating this Book as obscure and perplex'd, seeing he himself supposes that 'tis *John Scot's*? First, Does he not know that *Scot's* Book was condemned by the Synod of *Verceil* as an Heretical piece. Secondly, That 'twas so before at *Paris* by a kind of Synod who censured it in the same terms. Thirdly, That another Council at *Rome* caused it to be burnt six years after the Council of *Verceil*. Fourthly, That *John Scot's* Book was compos'd on this platform, *That the Sacrament of the Altar is not the true Body nor true Blood of our Lord, but only a memorial of his true Body and Blood, as Hincmar and Ascelin say.* Fifthly, That *Berenger* has taken the Book of *John Scot* for an authentick testimony of his Faith, and *Lanfranc* also for an avowed adversary of *Paschasius*. Sixthly, That in the 12th. Century *Cessor's* anonymous Author testifies the Author of this Book was respected as an adversary to *Paschasius*, in the same manner as he had been in the preceding Century. Seventhly, That supposing *Bertram's* Book be *John Scot's*, whatsoever I now mention'd must be referred to him. Eighthly, That in effect *Bertram's* Book was attributed to *Oecolampadius*. Ninthly, That it was proscribed by I know not how many expurgatory Indexes. Tenthly, That the Divines of *Doway* and others with 'em, not being able to admit the Doctrine, have affirm'd it has been altered. In fine, that the Author of the *Dissertation* himself acknowledges that *Berenger* or his Disciples considered this Book as a Buckler for 'em, which 'twas their interest to preserve at the expence of the greatest fraud and treachery.

*Durand. Truar.  
de Corp. &  
Sang. Chr.  
part 9.  
De Prædest.  
cap. 31. Epist.  
ad Berenger. in  
Lanf. oper.*

DARE the Author of the *Dissertation* say that *Hincmar* has understood the

the sentiment of *John Scot* better than *John Scot* himself; that the Councils of the 11th. Century have rashly condemned a Writing which at most was but an obscure and perplex'd one? That Pope *Leo IX.* *Nicholas II.* and the 113 Bishops which constrained *Berenger* to burn *John Scot's* Book were deceived in it, that *Berenger* nor his Adversaries, nor his Disciples, have not comprehended what made for 'em or against 'em during several years Dispute, and that in fine the 12th. Century remain'd in as great an ignorance? I wonder how the Author of the *Dissertation*, or Mr. *Arnaud* can speak of this Book as they do; which is to say, that it is obscure and perplexed, in supposing *John Scot* to be the Author of it. I can scarcely believe that if these Gentlemen do satisfy themselves, they can also satisfy the ingenuous of their own party that have read it. But that I may handle more fully this point, I intend to establish clearly two things, First, That this Book of the Body and Blood of our Lord publish'd under the name of *Bertram*, is in effect *Ratram's*, and not *John Scot's*. Secondly, That the authority of this Book will not cease to be very considerable, supposing *John Scot* were the Author of it. I hope I shall commodiously reduce under these two heads, whatsoever the Author has treated of greatest importance in his *Dissertation*.

### C H A P. III.

*That Ratram is the Author of the Book of our Lords Body and Blood, publish'd under the name of Bertram.*

**T**O confirm this truth, I shall first bring as convincing proofs as can be brought for these kind of Facts. Secondly, I shall produce the acknowledgment of the most learned Romanists who have acknowledged this verity, even since some of 'em have question'd it. Lastly, I shall shew that this is not a discovery which *Vsser* first made, and that whatsoever the Author of the *Dissertation* brings against that Pre'ares proofs cannot overthrow them. See here the proofs.

**FIRST**, *Sigebert* a Monk of *Gemblou*, attributes in his Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers the Book of *our Lords Body and Blood* to the Author of the Book of *Predestination*: Now this Book of *Predestination* is acknowledged to be *Ratram's*. And in effect altho' *Suffridus Petrus*, who caused *Sigebert's* Catalogue to be Printed, has inserted the name of *Bertram* in his Edition, he does himself remark, that two Manuscripts, one of the Abby of *Gemblou*, the other of the Priory of *Vauvert*, had distinctly the name of *Ratram*, and not that of *Bertram*. This testimony of *Sigebert* is considerable for three reasons. First, Because he was one of the most inquisitive Historians of his time, as appears by his Chronicle. Secondly, Because he did not write his Catalogue till he had spent the greatest part of his life in the reading of the Authors of which he speaks in his Catalogue. Thirdly, Because that having lived a great while in the 11th. Century (for he died but in the year 1113.) he had a particular knowledg of what passed in the Disputes between *Berenger* and his Adversaries, and the Authors which were alledged on either hand.



AS *Trithemius* in his Catalogue has followed *Sigebert*, excepting that he spoke more particularly of the Author of the Book of *the Body and Blood of our Lord*, and of *Predestination*; it is plain that altho it has likewise the name of *Bertram*, or *Bertramnus*, he design'd *Ratramnus*, and that the rather, that 'tis undeniable: First, That there was no Author of *Bertram's* name in the 9th. Century. Secondly, That the Elogies which he gives to *Bertram* are suitable only to *Ratramnus*, by the consent of all learned men, That 'twould be a wonderful thing, for neither *Trithemius* nor *Sigebert* to mention a word of *Ratramnus*, one of the most famous Authors of the 9th. Century.

SECONDLY, an anonymous Author, who apparently wrote since *Algerus*, which is to say, about the year 1140. formally attributes to *Ratram* to have wrote a Treatise of the Body and Blood of our Lord against the sentiments of *Paschasius Ratbert*, and dedicated it to the French King *Charles the Bald*. Now this is what agrees precisely with the Book which bears the name of *Bertram*. For first, he directly decides against the Doctrine of *Paschasius*, altho he does not name him. Secondly, it is dedicated to King *Charles*. Thirdly, The arguments which the anonymous Author relates as being common to *Raban* and *Ratram*, are found in the Book publish'd under the name of *Bertram*.

THIRDLY, The style and Hypothesis of this Book of *Bertram* are wholly the same with those of other Writings of *Ratram*, as I shall make appear. But before we come to this, behold another proof which alone is sufficient to decide our question.

FOURTHLY, There are Manuscripts of the Book of *the Body and Blood of our Lord*, which bear the same name of *Ratram*. First, Those that in 1532. caused this Book to be Printed at *Cologne*, expressly observe, that they preferred the name of *Bertram* before any other name of the same Author, which appeared to them less known. Let the Reader know, say they, that altho the name of this Author is to be met with elsewhere express'd in another manner, yet this name (to wit of *Bertram*) being most common and familiar, ought to be preferred before any other. This other name can be none but that of *Ratramnus*, which appear'd to them less known than that of *Bertram*, only because that in 1531. which is to say, a year before the Edition of the Book of *the Body and Blood of our Lord*, the Catalogue of the Ecclesiastical Writers of *Trithemius* was publish'd at *Cologne* it self, and therein mention made of this Author under the name of *Bertram*, and not under that of *Ratram*. Secondly, The Divines of *Doway* had without question some Manuscripts of the Book of *Our Lords Body and Blood* under the name of *Ratramnus*, without which they could not say of *Bertram*, what they have said. Thirdly, Cardinal *Perron* attests he saw at Mr. *Le Fevre's* the Prince's Tutor, an ancient Manuscript of the Book of *the Body and Blood of our Lord*, under the name of *Ratramnus*.

In Indic. Bibl.  
v. voce Bertram  
lib. 2. de Bertram  
Aut. 39. p. 6. 6.

THESE proofs be convincing to rational men; the only thing which has rais'd any scruple is the name of *Bertram*, which some Transcribers, and those that have publish'd it from these Copies, have put in, instead of the true name, which was *Ratramnus*: but this signifies little. For first, 'tis certain that *Bertram's* Book was written in the 9th. Century, in which time there

Erasmus, page  
132, 133.

there was no Author named *Bertram*: so that this must needs be a corrupted name thro the ignorance of some Transcribers. It is then fitting to attribute this Book to one of the Authors of those times whose name comes nearest to that of *Bertram*. Now 'tis certain there is none which comes nearer than *Ratram*. *Theophilus Raynaud* the Jesuit has acknowledged this truth. *Howeasse* has it been, says he; to confound *Bertram* and *Ratram* in so great an affinity and resemblance of names. We may alledg two causes of this confusion which are very probable: First, 'Twas the custom to give the name *Beatus* to illustrious men in the Church, instead of *Sanctus*, which has been since affectedly given 'em, of which there are thousands of instances in Manuscripts and Printed Books. 'Tis then very likely that some Transcribers finding in Manuscripts the Title of this Book, *B. Ratrami*, or *Be. Ratrami*, which signifies *Beati Ratramni*, they have imprudently joyn'd all these Letters, and made thereof but one name. Thus in the Edition of *Aldus*, instead of reading *P. Cornutus*, which signifies *Publius Cornutus*, they have joyn'd the Letters of the Manuscript which should be separate, whereof they have made the barbarous name of *Phornutus*. Secondly, It is likely that the conformity of the letter B with the Letter R which in the ancient Impressions and Manuscripts, differ only in one stroke, may have given way to this Error. The likeness of Capital Letters has produced like changes, the Author of the *Dissertation* himself tells us that in two Manuscripts of the Abby of *S. Victor*, the Transcribers have written *Babanus* instead of *Rabanus*. And thus do we read in some Manuscripts of *Haimon* of *Halberstat*, *Raymo* for *Haymo*.

Sic mediet Tho.  
waldensis, an.  
1521. Paris.  
Labbe de Script.  
p. 205. T. 2.

SECONDLY, It is certain that in respect of the Book it self, there are none of the Authors of the 9th. Century to whom we can attribute this Book but to *Ratram*. This Book supposes in its Preface that there hapned a terrible division between the Subjects of *Charles the Bald* touching the Eucharist; and that this Prince according to his Piety, searching the means to reduce to the purity of the Faith those that had changed it, engaged the Author of the Book of *our Lords Body and Blood* to tell him his thoughts on this subject. Now this time is exactly that wherein *Ratram* lived; and the esteem which *Charles the Bald* shews this Author, is precisely the same which he paid to *Ratram*, in an occasion like this. For his Subjects being divided on the matter of Grace and Predestination, he consulted *Ratramnus* on this difference, and shewed how greatly he valued his judgment in Theological Questions.

ALL these reasons taken together do so well prove that the Book of *the Body and Blood of our Lord* is of *Ratramnus*, that those who have not consider'd 'em all, have yet yielded to the evidence of those they were acquainted with. We may moreover say, that if they have not been explain'd, they have been at least acknowledg'd before *Usher* by the Divines of *Doway*, whether they have seen Manuscripts of the Book of *the Body and Blood of our Lord*, which bore the name of *Ratram*, as 'tis likely they did, or believ'd with *Raynaud*, that this corruption of the name of *Bertram* did not hinder but that *Ratram* must be acknowledg'd to be the Author of it. In effect, whence could they divine these three things, First, That *Bertram* was a Monk of *Corby* as well as a Priest, *Trithemius* and *Sigebert* having never said so, and the Title of the Book bearing *Presbyteri*, and not *Monachi*. Secondly, That this Book was not dedicated to *Charlemain*, but to *Charles the Bald*, altho the Edition runs *Ad Carolum magnum*. Thirdly, That

That the Author was a Catholick. Is not this a fair acknowledgment that *Bertram* is no other than *Ratram* an Author in whom these three things meet; if we compare the Title of the Book with what Authors say, that have spoken of this Religious. This is the judgment of the Divines of *Doway*, whom *Usher* has only followed.

AFTER the Divines of *Doway* and Bishop *Usher*, who discovered this truth more distinctly, Mr. *De Marca* was one of the first who lent his hand to it, as appears from his Treatise in French of the Eucharist wrote before the year 1640. and publish'd by Monsieur the Abbot *Faget* his Cousin. *Theophilus Raynaud* the Jesuit has since likewise follow'd the same sentiment in his Treatise of good and bad Books. Mr. *Manguin* acknowledges it likewise in his famous defences of Grace, wherein he has been follow'd by Mr. *Hermon* a Canon of *Beauvais*, under the Title of *HIERONIMUS AB ANGELO FORTI*. *Cellot* the Jesuit agrees in this point with Mr. *Herman* and Mr. *Manguin*, altho he elsewhere opposes the later in several things. *De Luc d' Achery* and Mr. *De S. Beuve*, have equally testifi'd they were of the same opinion, the one in his Preface on the first Tome of his *Spicilege*, th'other in his Manuscript Lectures on the Eucharist.

*Erortem*, p. 132.  
*Dissert. Hist.*  
p. 134.

*Epist.* 3. S.  
xxiii. & seq.  
*opp. ad hist.*  
*Goth.* p. 569;  
col. 2.

'TIS true that since the late conjecture of Mr. *De Marca* became publick, to wit that *John Scot* is the Author of the Work of our Lords Body and Blood, and not *Ratram*, *De Luc* seems to yield to this novelty, and has since been followed by the Author of the *Perpetuity* who speaks of it in a doubtful manner, and by the Author of the *Dissertation* which I examin. But a while after the learned Jesuit *Labbeus* opposed this conjecture of Mr. *De Marca* as handsomly as he could in a Book which he dedicated to him. For in this Book he takes indifferently *Bertram* and *Ratram* for one and the same Author. Mr. *Pavillon* also ingenuously acknowledges in his Book against Mr. *Daillé* that *Ratram* and *Bertram* are but one and the same person, citing always *Ratram* of the Body and Blood of our Lord. The famous Jesuit *Novet* against Mr. *Claude* shews in this matter the same sincerity as Mr. *Pavillon*, and Mr. *Arbusti* has follow'd them in his declaration.

*Prefat. in T. 2.*  
*Spicil.*  
Part 3. c. 5.  
T. 1. de Script.  
*Eccl.* p. 53. &  
T. 2. p. 66.  
Triumph of  
the Euchar. p.  
18, 63, 66, 68,  
94, 95, 96, 97.

Preface of  
Jesus Christ  
in the Sacra-  
ment, book 5.  
ch. 2. p. 264.

HOWSOEVER it be, after the reasons which I have alledged, I believe I may affirm with all these learned men of the Church of *Rome*, that *Bertram* and *Ratram* are but one and the same Author. It only then remains that I refute in a few words what the Author of the *Dissertation* offers most considerable against some of these reasons.

TO one of these reasons, viz. that the Religious of *Corby* being named *Ratram*, and *Cellot's* anonymous Author saying that *Ratram* wrote a Book of the Body and Blood of our Lord; the Book of the Body and Blood of our Lord, known under the name of *Bertram*, is then *Ratram's*: to this reason, I say, our Author answers, that altho *Cellot* caused the name of *Ratramnus* to be Printed in the two places of his Anonymous, wherein are mention'd *Paschasius* his Adversaries; yet 'tis not thus found in two Manuscripts of the Abby of *S. Victor*: but in the first there's *Intramus*, and in the second *Ratramnus*, *Cellot* having caused the name of *Ratramnus* to be Printed contrary to what the Manuscripts bear.

Artic. 2. of the  
*Dissert.* on  
*John Scot.*

BUT this answer is not sufficient. First, *Cellot* has caused his Anonymous to be Printed from Father *Sirmond's* Copy, who had taken it from a



De Success.  
Eccles. p. 39.  
c. 2.  
Du Perron,  
Book 2 Auth.  
39. p. 666.

Manuscript of *Corby*, and not from the Manuscripts of the Abby of *S. Victor*. Secondly, These two Manuscripts which are apparently false, are not so considerable as the Manuscripts of the Anonymous, mention'd by *Usher* and others, which have all of 'em the name of *Ratramnus*, nor as the Manuscript of the Book of *the Body and Blood of our Lord* which bears the name of *Ratramnus*, nor as the Manuscripts of the Catalogue of *Sigebert*, of which we have spoken. The *Intram* of the Manuscripts of the Abby of *S. Victor*, is the Transcribers fault, who has disfigured the name of *Ratramnus*, just as his *Babanus* is the famous *Raban*.

De Success. Ecc.  
c. 2.

TO another reason drawn from *Sigebert*, who makes the Author of the Book of *Predestination*, to wit *Ratramnus*, the Author of the Book of *the Body and Blood of our Lord*, and of whom in effect two Manuscripts represent the name of *Ratramus*, instead of *Bertramus*: to this reason, I say, the Author answers, First, That the work of *Bertram* of *Predestination* is different from that of *Ratramnus*, because that according to *Trithemius* the work of *Bertram* contain'd only one Book, and was not dedicated to *Charles the Bald*, whereas that of *Ratram* is dedicated to him, and contains two Books. Secondly, That all the Editions of *Sigebert* having constantly the name of *Bertram*, we may believe that a fault has slip't into the Manuscripts of *Gemblou*, and of *Vauvert*, where we have the name of *Ratramnus*.

BUT these two Answers are not satisfactory: As to the first, *Trithemius* as well as *Sigebert*, says positively in two places that the Book of *Bertram* of *Predestination* is dedicated to *Charles the Bald*, and brings such reasons for the proof of what he says, that there's no way to avoid the force of his testimony. Secondly, Either our Author supposes that *Trithemius* saw a Treatise of *Predestination* under the name of *Bertram* which contain'd only one Book, or he will have him not to have seen it, as he believes that *Trithemius* has not seen the Book of our Lords Body and Blood. If *Trithemius* has seen this Treatise of *Predestination*, what is become of it since *Trithemius* his time? How comes it to pass no body ever heard of it, but this our Author? If *Trithemius* never saw it, why will our Author give credit to his testimony, when the question concerns this Book of *Predestination*, and yet will not have us believe what he says of the Book of *the Body and Blood of our Lord*. Thirdly, Our Author abuses the passage of *Trithemius*, *Trithemius* has follow'd *Sigebert*, and by *librum* seems to understand *opus* a work, without having respect to the number of the parts of which it is compos'd; unless we will suppose that one number has escap'd the Printer, and that instead of these words *de Predestinatione j.* we should read *de Predestinatione jj.* which is very possible, and of which there are an hundred examples in the Catalogue of *Trithemius* now in question.

OUR Author's second Answer is something worse than the first. I know but two Editions of *Sigebert*, that of *Suffridus Petrus*, and that of *Miræus*, which in my opinion has been publish'd from that of *Suffridus*. Now as far as one can judg of 'em, the Manuscripts of *Gemblou* and *Vauvert* ought to be preferred to these Editions, because the Manuscript of *Gemblou* perhaps is the original of *Sigebert's* own hand, who wrote and died at *Gemblou*. We know very well how great a difference there is between the Edition of the Chronicle of *Sigebert* by *Miræus* from a

Manu.

Manuscript of *Gemblou*, and the other Editions publish'd from Manuscripts which have been corrupted. But supposing this were not *Sigebert's* own Hand-writing, 'tis certain the Monks of an Abby know best the hands of Transcribers who have preceded them in the same place. It is likely then that this Manuscript was more correct than those to be met with elsewhere. This Manuscript of *Gemblou* is moreover confirm'd by the Manuscript of the Priory of *Vauvert*, and in fine by the Manuscripts of the Book of *the Body and Blood of our Lord*, which bear the name of *Ratramnus*, as I have represented.

See Labb. de  
script. Eccles.  
in Sigib.

OUR Author acquits himself not much better in another Argument which one may draw from this, that in the Book of *the Birth of Christ*, *Ratramnus* defends the same Doctrin which is taught in the Book of *the Body and Blood of our Lord*. He tells us that Bishop *Usher* is he that has made this judgment on the Book of *the Birth of Christ*; but that this Treatise being at present publick, this conjecture of *Usher* can only serve to discover the insincerity of this Protestant, because there's not to be found one word of the mystery of the Eucharist in the Book of *the Birth of Jesus Christ*. He adds hereunto other things, which do not belong to our subject, and which I do not refute as I might, lest I turn aside the Readers mind from the point in hand.

BUT he is to blame in accusing Bishop *Usher* of deceit. For what he says of this Book *de Nativitate Christi*, is comprehended in a Parenthesis, and there is neither affectation nor heat in producing it. It appears that this is a new discovery which he made since he wrote his Treatise of the *Succession and State of the Christian Churches*, wherein this remark had been proper. When he made this observation on the Book of *the Birth of Jesus Christ*, he handled a quite different subject, to wit, the History of *Gothevalc*. The Manuscripts which he cites, were not in his hands alone, neither did he suppress them: he carefully denotes the places where they were, and they may be easily found out. *After all*, says he, *we are so far from reading the Doctrin of Bertram in the Book of the Birth of Christ, that we find not one word of the mystery of the Eucharist therein*. Supposing this be true? must therefore Bishop *Usher* be an Impostor unworthy of credit? That Prelate only says that the same Doctrin is to be found in the Book of *the Birth of Jesus Christ*, which is in that of *the Body and Blood of our Lord*. He does not make a particular mention of the Eucharist. But if he meant so, we need only cast our eyes on some places of this Book of *the Birth of Jesus Christ*, to approve of his judgment. We know that the Book of *the Body and Blood of our Lord*, combating the substantial Presence of the Body of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist, rejects likewise as an absurdity, the opinion which asserts that the Body of Jesus Christ may be in several places, and the Book of *the Birth of Jesus Christ* distinctly asserts that the Body of Jesus Christ, is so determin'd by its nature to be in one place, that 'tis impossible for it to be in two places at once; altho our Lord is every where in respect of his Divinity. And thus does it combat the natural consequences of *Paschasius* his opinion, which certainly suffices to justify *Usher* if he respected this matter.

Tom. 1. Spicil.  
p. 323, 324.  
c. 3.

AS to the reason which we draw from the conformity which there is between the Book of *the Body and Blood of our Lord*, and the works of *Ratram*, the Author answers that this conjecture might have some force were

the question, whether the Book of *the Body and Blood of our Lord* was written by *Ratram*, or *Oecolampadius*; but at present when 'tis doubted whether it be the work of *Ratram*, or of some other Author of the same Century, it is useleſs, moſt Authors of the 9th. Century finiſhing or beginning their Books, with acknowledgments of their own weakneſs and inabilities, like to thoſe which are to be met with in the undoubted Writings of *Ratram*, and in that of *Bertram*, for which he alledges ſome examples taken out of two Treatiſes of *John Scot*.

BUT he pitifully eludes this reaſon. It is taken from the whole ſtyle and genius of the Book of *the Body and Blood of our Lord*, compared with the ſtyle and genius of the works of *Ratram*, and not from ſome ſentences which ſeem conformable therein. *Cellot* and Mr. *Claude* were of this opinion. And certainly th' Inſcriptions of the Books are alike; the Book of *Predeſtination* is aſcribed *Domino glorioſo præcellentiſſimo principi Carolo, Ratramnus*, and that of the *Body and Blood of our Lord* begins *Glorioſe Principis*; whereas *John Scot* calls *Charles Seniore*. He is treated with the Title of Magnificent in *Ratram's* Book of *Predeſtination*, and in that of the *Body and Blood of our Lord* in like manner. *Ratram* being engag'd by the Kings Command to write of *Predeſtination*, ſhews great modeſty in obeying; which alſo appears in the Book of *the Body and Blood of our Lord*. *Ratram* commends the King's Piety for his enquiries into Religion, and ſubmits to his Cenfures. All which is ſeen in the Book of *the Body and Blood of our Lord*. *Ratram* follows the holy Fathers with ſuch zeal, that in the firſt Book of *Predeſtination*, he brings into every line almoſt the ſayings of *S. Auguſtin*, *Proſper*, *Salvien*, *Gregory*, upon which he makes reflections. And thus does he likewiſe in the ſecond, wherein he only cites Orthodox Authors; and the ſame method he uſes in the ſecond part of the Book of *the Body and Blood*. There can be nothing more regular than the method of *Ratram* in his Books of *Predeſtination*, he deſcends to the foundation, and divides his whole ſubject into two queſtions: we find the ſame regularity in the Book of *the Body and Blood of our Lord*: the recapitulations are in a manner the ſame. We ſee therein the ſame modeſty in not naming thoſe againſt whom he wrote, in conſerving the glorious quality of the Moderator of *Charles the Bald*: we meet with the ſame thing in the Book of *the Body and Blood of our Lord*.

WE might confirm the ſame truth by comparing the Treatiſe of *the Body and Blood of our Lord* with the other works of *Ratram*, were that trouble any way neceſſary. But I believe this is ſufficient to perſuade thoſe who weigh things.

IT is certain that our Author produces a reaſon to ſhew that *Ratram* is not the Author of the Book of *the Body and Blood of our Lord*. He draws it from the ſilence of *Hincmar*. This ſilence, ſays he, diſcovers ſo evidently th' injuſtice which has been done to *Ratram* in attributing the Book of *Bertram* to him, that ſuppoſing we had no other proofs to juſtify him, this here will be more than ſufficient to take away all ſuſpicions which within theſe few years have been entertain'd touching his integrity in the Faith. There is no likelihood, if we believe our Author, that *Hincmar*, who on one hand was animated againſt *Ratram*, and wrote againſt him a great Book concerning *Predeſtination*, and this expreſſion *Trina Deitas*; and who on the other condemned as an error and novelty contrary to the Faith the Opinion of

T. I. Manguin;  
P. 29.  
Microp. p. 512.  
T. I. Mang.  
P. 109.]

T. I. Mang.  
P. 10.  
Microp. p. 513,  
514.  
T. I. Mang.  
P. 61.  
T. I. Mang.  
P. 13.



of *John Scot*, who said, that the Eucharist was not our Lord's true Body, but only its figure and memorial, would not have reproached *Ratram* on this subject, had he believed him the Author of this Book which goes under the name of *Bertram*, seeing this Book yielded occasion enough to a passionate enemy, as *Hincmar* was, to charge him with this Heresie.

BUT this reflection is but a silly one. First, from one word which *Hincmar* has uttered against *John Scot* in favour of *Paschasius*, we must not conclude that *Hincmar* was at full liberty to write against *Ratramnus*, and encounter him as an Heretick. Secondly, I do not see why *Hincmar* should be so mightily transported against *Ratram*, who spake without heat, and mentioned not any of those against whom he wrote. If *Hincmar* was transported against *Ratram* on another subject, it does not hence follow he must be always in the like passion on all subjects which he had to debate with this Religious. Thirdly, This our Author supposes without reason that *Hincmar* was in a condition to insult over *Ratram* on the question of the Eucharist, as he did in that of *Predestination*, and there is herein a great deal of difference. When *Hincmar* was so greatly transported against *Ratram*, 'twas because he had the Council of *Cressy* on his side, 'twas because *John Scot* declared himself for him against *Gothescalc* and *Ratram*; 'twas because the famous *Raban* had prejudicated in his favour in a Council held at *Mayence* in 848. but there was nothing like this in the question of the Eucharist. *John Scot* had declared himself against the sentiments of *Paschasius*; the King knew it, and kept him in his Palace, which was a sufficient prejudice against *Hincmar*. The famous *Raban* consulted by *Heribold* Bishop of *Auxerre* and Arch-Chaplain, that is to say, great Almoner, had clearly taken part against the sentiments of the same *Paschasius*; and the learned Church of *Lyons* who had persecuted *John Scot*, whilst he defended the opinions of *Hincmar* touching *Predestination*, ceased molesting him when he combated the sentiments of *Paschasius* on the Doctrin of the Eucharist. Fourthly, Our Author supposes with the same rashness that *Hincmar* believed this Controversie to be as important as it is at this day, which is contrary to all probability. For, First, *Hincmar* contents himself with criticising on the opinion of *John Scot* in very soft terms, he does not call it Heresie, but *novelty of words*, whereas *Raban* and *Hincmar* term'd the opinion of *Gothescalc* on the Divine Grace, Heresie, and Schism. Secondly, If we come to compare what *Hincmar* says against *Ratram* on the *trina Deitas*, shall we not find that what he says against *John Scot* contains nothing so outrageous? *Hincmar* was a friend of *Raban*'s who wrote a Letter to *Egilon* Abbot of *Prom*, and afterwards Arch-Bishop of *Sens*, against the Doctrin of *Paschasius*: he was a friend of this *Raban* who had opposed him in his answer to *Heribold*, publish'd by *Stewart*. *Hincmar* always mentions *Heribold* with a great deal of respect, even after his death, altho *Heribold* was so far from being of *Paschasius* his opinion, that in the later ages, the name of *Heriboldiens* was given to the Disciples of *Berenger*, as we find in the Writings of *Tho. Waldensis*. Fifthly, If this silence of *Hincmar* proves that *Ratram* did not write the Book of the *Body and Blood of our Lord*, because *Hincmar* would have reproached him with it, what judgment must we make of this Authors affirming that *John Scot* wrote this Book of *Bertram*'s, altho the Church of *Lyons* which wrote so fiercely against him, has not reproached him with it? Why did not also *Prudentius* do it in his Treatise against *Hincmar* and *Pardulus*? Was not this the ready way to decry these two Bishops, to reproach them that they made use of the Pen of a pro-

*Maug. Dissert. Hist. p. 141.*

*Vide Dissert. Hist. Maug. p. 357, 358. Penit. cap. 33. T. 1. Maug. p. 21.*

*T. 2. de Sacra. c. 61.*

profest enemy to the Real Presence and Transubstantiation? Why did *Nicholas* the first suffer this Heresie growing in the bosom of *Charles the Bald*, without warning this Prince of it? That same *Nicholas* who concerned himself so much in the affairs on this side the Mountains, and used all means to inform himself of 'em? *Nicholas* the first shall bestir himself in the affair of *Rothadus* of *Soissons* in that of *Hincmar* of *Laon*, where the point was only about Discipline, and remain unconcerned in the business of *John Scot*, altho he erred in the Eucharist. He shall take notice of the affairs of *Elbon* of *Reims*, and those whom he had ordain'd, and not take any notice of a question agitated at the Court of *Charles the Bald*, in which this Prince did interest himself? He shall know that *Raban* had opposed the Real Presence by publick Writings, that he to whom *Raban* wrote was become Arch-Bishop of *Sens*, that an Arch-Chaplain had erred in this matter, and all this without being concerned? The fault which our Author commits in this reflection on the silence of *Hincmar*, proceeds from his not minding two things; the one is that, we must not always ground our selves on peoples proposing their sentiments in advantageous terms, and speaking the opinion of their adversaries with disdain and contempt. This is particularly the stile of *Hincmar* in every matter he treats of, as it has been already observ'd by Mr. *Mauguin* and Mr. *De la Motte*, which cannot be unknown to our Author, For example, he always treats *Gottescalc* as an Heretick, altho it be believ'd at *Port Royal*, that *Gottescalc* defended only *S. Austin's* Doctrine on the matter of Grace.

*Dissert. Hist.*  
p. 357, 358.  
Apol. for the  
Holy Fathers,  
part 5. p. 297.

THE other is, that our Author has conceiv'd that the censure of *Hincmar* against *John Scot* imports that *Hincmar* believ'd the Real Presence with its consequences, as the Adoration, the Sacrifice, &c. which has made him judg that *Hincmar* must respect the opinion of *John Scot* as a detestable Heresie. Now 'tis certain that the consequences of the Real Presence were then unknown to the whole Earth, and were not received into the Latin Church till some Ages after *Hincmar*. But this last remark respects the main of the question which does not belong to me to handle.

#### C H A P. IV.

*A Refutation of what the Author of the Dissertation offers to persuade that the Book of the Body and Blood of our Lord, Publish'd under the Name of Bertram is of John Scot.*

HAVING hitherto firmly enough establish'd that the Book of our Lords Body and Blood is of *Ratram*, I might pass by whatsoever the Author of the *Dissertation* alledges to fortifie the Conjecture of Mr. *De Marca*; and truly seeing that before Mr. *De Marca*, no man of learning, nor any of *Berenger's* enemies; either in the 11th. Century, or in the following, made this discovery; seeing that the Author of the *Perpetuity of the Faith* entertain'd at first the opinion of Mr. *De Marca* with mistrust, that he might handsomly leave it, if he were forced: It thereupon seems I have right to despise whatsoever our Author alledges to make the world believe that the Book of *Bertram* is the Book of *John Scot* under a foreign Title. Nevertheless I will shew that the proofs which he offers have no solidity.

THESE

THESE proofs are, 1. That the Book of *Bertram* is entirely conformable to what we read in ancient Writers concerning that of *John Scot*. Art. 3. of the Dissert. on John Scot.  
 2. That the proper character of *John Scot* is therein to be met with. But at bottom he establishes neither one nor the other.

AS to the first, our Author relates a passage of *Ascelin* in a Letter to *Berenger*, whence he believes one may gather, that the work of *John Scot* contain'd only one Book, and that small enough: that a man cannot presently perceive in *John Scot's* Book what was his opinion on the mystery of the Eucharist; that maugre the dissimulations of *John Scot*; yet *Ascelin* found therein his whole design was to persuade the Readers that what is Consecrated on the Altars is not truly the Body and Blood of our Lord; that to compass his drift *John Scot* made use of several passages of the Fathers, and at the end of each passage added some gloss to bring the sense of 'em to his purpose; that amongst others, *John Scot* recited at length an Orison of *S. Gregory*, which begins with these words, *Perficiant in nobis*, and having trifled with some places of *S. Ambrose*, *S. Jerom*, and *S. Austin*, whom he principally made use of, as *Berenger* insinuates, he forms his conclusion in these terms, *Specie geruntur ista non veritate*. And these are the things which as our Author thinks agree with *Bertram's* Book. ibid. sect. 1.

BUT these reflections which our Author pretends one may also make on the Book of *Bertram*, are either unessential for his design, or want a foundation. 1. Nothing hinders that two works touching the Eucharist may have been short enough to be equally treated as small Books. 2. I have shew'd that our Author is mistaken. when he calls *Bertram's* Book an obscure and intricate piece. Even *Ascelin* does not scruple to treat *John Scot* as an Heretick by reason of his sentiment on the Eucharist; and our Author has not well enough comprehended the Text of *Ascelin*. 3. Two Authors who hold the same opinion should likewise aim at the same mark. They must if they are endued with common sense, from the same reflections in substance on the passages of the Fathers which they would have to serve their designs. These two Characters then are too general and wide. And for the two last considerations, 1. Who doubts that two Authors, one of whom has apparently read the Book of the other, as *Ratram* may have read that of *John Scot*, may not cite the same authorities? *Ratram* and *Raban* have done it, as we are inform'd by the Anonymous of *Cellot*. 2. 'Tis not true *Berenger* has insinuated that *John Scot* cited principally *S. Ambrose*, *S. Jerom*, and *S. Austin*. *Berenger* says *John Scot* cannot be respected as an Heretick, without throwing this ignominy on these Fathers and several others. But he does not say that *John Scot* cited particularly these three holy Doctors, and should he have said it, this character would be too general, there having been scarcely any of the Authors of the 9th. Century, who have not affected to follow chiefly these three Doctors. 3. Our Author ought not to propose as a character of identity, that *Bertram* has drawn the same conclusion from the Orison *Perficiant in nobis*, as *John Scot* has done: for to speak properly, this conclusion, *Specie geruntur ista non veritate*, is not of *Bertram*, nor of *John Scot*, but the Text it self of the Prayer which bears, *Ut quæ nunc specie gerimus, veritate capiamus*: now it is apparent that they were equally obliged to conserve these terms in their conclusion, and that they could neither of 'em do it, in a more natural manner than in forming it thus, *Specie geruntur ista non veritate*. We must also



so observe, and that as *Ascelin* relates, that *John Scot* cited this Orison under the name of *S. Gregory*, whereas *Bertram* cites it as the common Service of the Church, and that how great soever the conformity has been between the conclusion of these Authors in respect of the sense and words, it is not so great in respect of the construction of 'em. *Bertram* having these words, *In specie geruntur ista non in veritate*, and *John Scot* these, *Specie geruntur ista non in veritate*, which proves that these are two different Authors.

THE second witness which our Author produces is *Berenger*, who informs us that the Book of *John Scot* was wrote at the intreaty of a King of France, and that this King was *Charlemain*. Our Author pretends that these two particulars are to be met with in the Book of *Bertram*, which is dedicated to *Charlemain*, and was written by his order.

BUT these conformities conclude nothing; not the first, because 'twas very possible that *Charles the Bald* had at the same time obliged two learned men to write on the same subject; one who dwelt in his Palace, to wit, *John Scot*, and the other whose name was so illustrious in his Kingdom, that he had already oblig'd him to write on the questions of *Predestination*, to wit, *Ratramnus*. This Character, is too general. Not the second, for it does not seem that the Book of *our Lords Body and Blood*, nor that of *John Scot* of the Eucharist, were inscribed, *Ad Carolum magnum Imperatorem*, but only, *Ad Carolum Regem*, which is what one may recollect from *Sigebert*, from the Abbot *Trithemius*, from *John Bishop of Rochester*, and the Censurers of *Doway*, in reference to the Book of *Bertram*, whose Author they place under the time of *Lothairius*, and *Charles the Bald*, altho the Book of *Bertram* has no mark of time, whereas without doubt they would have placed him under the Reign of *Charlemain*, had the Manuscripts for title, *Ad Carolum magnum Imperatorem*. And for that of *John Scot*, it is to be believ'd that it having been written at the same time, and having an Inscription almost alike, *Berenger* is mistaken in applying to *Charlemain* what ought to be referred to *Charles the Bald*. At least 'tis by a mistake of this nature that *Sigebert* has placed *Usuard* and *Hincmar* under the Reign of *Charlemain*; wherein *Sigebert* has been follow'd by *Trithemius*, altho both one and the other have written under *Charles the Bald*, as all the world acknowledges in respect of *Hincmar*, and as *Bollandus* and *Labbeus* acknowledge in respect of *Usuard*.

*De Script. Eccl.*  
*cat. c. 95.*  
*Catal. fol. 57.*  
*Prolog. in lib. 4.*  
*adv. Oecol.*  
*Indic. Belg.*

*Sigeb. Catal.*  
*c. 84. & 99.*  
*De Script.*  
*Eccl. fol. 53. &*  
*55.*  
*Præfat. gener.*  
*in vit. Sanct.*  
*c. 4. sect. 7.*  
*Labbe de Script.*  
*Eccl. T. 2.*  
*p. 820. & seq.*

BUT supposing that the Book of *John Scot* was inscrib'd *Ad Carolum Magnum Imperatorem*, as is at this day that of *Bertram* in the Impressions, how will it hence follow that these two Books are but one and the same? Because, says our Author, if we suppose that this Title is equally false, 'tis very difficult for chance to produce the same falsity in two different Books, which in other respects had so great resemblance. And if it be pretended that the Title is true, it will be moreover very strange for the fancy of two different persons to meet in giving it this Title.

THIS difficulty is a small one, we do not say that *Ratram* and *John Scot* have given the Title of *Charlemain* to *Charles the Bald*, but affirm it not to be so strange a thing, that *Berenger* having attributed to *Charlemain* what ought to be apply'd to *Charles the Bald*, those that came after should refer to *Charlemain* a like Title, this Prince passing for a lover of Theological learning, as having been the restorer of it: The examples which I alledged prove

prove the thing possible, seeing they prove it to have hapned. *Berenger* then is no more favourable to our Author than *Ascelin* was.

AS to *Durand* of *Troarn*, I see moreover less reason why our Author should produce what *Durand* has said of the Council of *Paris*, wherein the Book of *John Scot* was condemned, *Damnatis Berengarii complicibus cum codice Joannis Scoti ex quo ea quæ damnabantur sumpta videbantur, concilio soluto discessum est*: For if it be true, as our Author will have it, that by this way of speaking *Durand* has insinuated that altho in the Council of *Paris* *John Scot*'s Book was condemned, yet was it not so evident a matter, that the Book of *John Scot* contains the sentiments of *Berenger*, which, as our Author believes, agrees likewise with the Book of *Bertram*, which he treats as obscure and perplexed, there can be nothing thence concluded but what will be to the disadvantage of this Council, wherein was condemned for heretical, what only ought to be esteemed obscure.

*Lib. de Corp. &  
Sang. Dom.  
part 9.*

BUT seeing our Author design'd to speak of the pretended obscurity of *John Scot*'s Writings, methinks he ought not to joyn to the place of *Durand* that of *Lanfranc*, who reproaches *Berenger*, that as soon as the Council assembled at *Rome* knew that by his highly praising the Book of *John Scot*, and blaming that of *Paschasius*, *Berenger* had deviated from the Faith of the Church, he was thrown out from the Communion of the Faithful; for 'tis not credible, the Council would have been so severe against the perplext style of *John Scot*, even to the condemning his Book to the flames, had not his Book been apparently written against *Paschasius*. And truly how could this be at first so understood both at *Paris*, at *Verceil*, and at *Rome* as that in the sense of these Councils, to praise *Paschasius* was properly to condemn *John Scot*?

OUR Author pretends in the last place, that seeing *Lanfranc*, *Berenger*, and *Ascelin*, and the rest of the Writers of the 11th. Century, mention only *John Scot* when they speak of the adversaries of *Paschasius* and their condemnation, one must conclude that from the time of *Lanfranc* and *Berenger*, there was no other Book known which appeared contrary to the Doctrine of *Paschasius* but that of *John Scot*.

BUT the silence of these Authors is no more favourable to him than their testimonies. In effect, supposing that in the 11th. Century there did not appear any other Book against *Paschasius* but *John Scot*'s, which cannot be affirm'd without rashness and injustice, considering the care which has been taken to conceal from us whatsoever might inform us in this point; it does not follow *John Scot*'s Book and *Bertram*'s be one and the same. By this reason must the Epistle of *Raban* to *Egilon*, and his answer to *Heribold* Bishop of *Auxerre*, wherein he has oppos'd the sentiments of *Paschasius*, be the Book of *John Scot*. For there was no mention of these Writings of *Raban*, in the time of *Berenger*, *Lanfranc* and *Ascelin*.

MOREOVER, our Author himself refutes his own opinion when he urges the silence of these Authors; for it appears by the testimony of *Lanfranc*, *Berenger*, and *Ascelin*, that *Paschasius* and *John Scot* were regarded as the two principal men in this Dispute: it is then very likely that the Book of *John Scot* was directly written against *Paschasius*: *Paschasius* was therein either named, or at least apparently meant, which is not so in the Writings

P P P

of

of *Bertram*, who handles matters in a less polemical manner, and never names *Paschasus*, nor seems to give the least hint of him, which has apparently tended to its preservation. And this is what I had to remark on the first proof of our Author.

Article 3. of  
the Dissert. on  
*John Scot.*

TO establish the second, to wit, that the proper character of the style of *Bertram* is the same as that of *John Scot*, our Author pretends that the several judgments of knowing persons of the Roman Communion and of our own, touching the Doctrin of *Bertram's* Book, are testimonies evident enough of the proper character of his genius, that is to say, of a genius naturally confused and perplex'd, or dissimulative, which fears to discover clearly its thoughts on the subject which it treats of, and affects to contradict it self the more dexterously to insinuate its own sentiment, and avoid censures. He assures us afterwards that this character appears with greater clearness in *John Scot's* Dialogue of Natures, and in his Book of Predestination; whence he concludes that we must not doubt but the Book of *Bertram* is *John Scot's*. It is in the same respect after our Author had alledged some instances of the contradictions of *John Scot*, and judged uncharitably that they proceeded not from a perplex'd and confused head, seeing that when he will he most clearly explains his notions without contradicting himself, but that these are only stratagems of a Philosopher who was more a Pagan than a Christian, he affirms the same may be found in *Bertram's* Book, which seems in twenty places to deviate from the Doctrin of the Real Presence, and which yet seems in as many places to approve of it, so that a man does not know where to have him.

BUT the two parts of our Authors remark contradict and oppose each other. For if *John Scot* had naturally a confused and perplexed mind, how comes it that he clearly explains his thoughts when he will, and keeps firm when he pleases without contradicting himself. This is not the character of a confused and perplexed head. Secondly, We ought not to believe that as soon as an Author falls into contradiction, which has sometimes hapned to the Fathers themselves, as every body knows, and especially in matters which have perplexed *John Scot*, and wherein he has contradicted himself, he then makes use of the stratagems of a Philosopher that is more a Pagan than a Christian. Thirdly, Our Author impertinently feigns that *Bertram* has affected obscurity and ambiguous expressions. This *Bertram*, be he who he will, was certainly upheld by King *Charles the Bald*, and *Heribold* the chief person of the Gallican Church was of his sentiment as well as *Raban*, and what is more remarkable it appears that he defended the publick Doctrin of the Church. Fourthly, Our Author should not alledg the judgment of the Centuriators of *Magdebourg* to shew this Book to be obscure in the judgments of those of our own party. If the Centuriators have suspected some expressions of *Bertram's* Book, we know that from 1537. *Bulinger* cited it with Elogies. Moreover, that some of the Doctors of the Roman Communion have mention'd *Bertram's* Book, as if it made for them. This is purely th' effect of this prejudice which has made them produce the writings of *Raban*, as if *Raban* had been of their opinion, altho 'twas well known in the 12th. Century that *Raban* wrote against *Paschasus*. The Censurers who condemned *Bertram's* Book, and who are publick persons, are sooner to be believed than private men.

Commentar. in  
1 ad Cor. 10.  
P. 190.

OUR



OUR Author remarks again a second character of the genius of *John Scot*, which he believes is in *Bertram's Book*, to wit, these arguments put in form, this crowd of Syllogisms and Enthymemes heapt up one upon another; these Maxims, and these Principles drawn from the Philosophy of *Aristotle*. For as he shews by the testimony of *S. Prudencius*, Bishop of *Troy*, and *Florus*, Deacon of the Church of *Lyons*, this is the way of *John Scot* in Disputes; he pretends that all this form of reasoning is to be met with in the Book of *the Body and Blood of our Lord*, of which he produces three instances.

BUT this other conformity is as ill grounded as the preceding ones. I confess that the way of *John Scot* is very argumentative. One may observe it in his Books of *Predestination*, as *Prudencius* and *Florus* have reproach'd him. But I do not see that because there are some Philosophical Arguments in *Bertram's Book*, (our Author produces but three, and those also contain'd in the same Period) he must immediately draw this conclusion, therefore the Book of *the Body and Blood of our Lord* is *John Scot's*. Nor yet had *Bertram* named any where *Aristotle*, which *John Scot* failed not to do, as appears in several places of his Manuscript Treatise of *Natures*. But *Bertram* has not so much as the name of this Philosopher.

YET seeing our Author puts us upon considering the genius of these Authors, let us shew a little what is the genius of *John Scot*, and that of *Bertram's*, whence it will clearly appear there's nothing so absurd as to make *John Scot* Author of the Book of *Bertram*. Here are some of their Characters.

BERTRAM follows the holy Scriptures and the Fathers, as he protests in the beginning; and *John Scot* prefers reason before any Authority. He makes this a Maxim, whence he particularly esteems Philosophy, and sends us at every moment to the Writings of *Aristotle*. He does thus in his Treatise of *Predestination*, as *Prudencius* and *Florus* justly upbraid him.

*De Nat. l. 1. p. 56. & lib. 4. p. 167.*

BERTRAM follows closely his subject without letting it go out of sight; and *John Scot* makes frequent Digressions, as we see particularly in his Manuscript Treatise of *Natures*.

BERTRAM seems to stick to certain Authors, as *S. Hierom*, *S. Augustin*, *S. Fulgencius*, *Isidor*, *S. Gregory*; and *John Scot* affects others, as *S. Basil*, *S. Gregory Nazianzen*, whom he confounds with *S. Gregory of Nyse*, *S. Ambrose*, the counterfeit *Denis the Areopagite*, *Boëtius*, *S. Maximus*. So that a body may say one of 'em apply'd himself to the Latin Fathers, and the other to the Greek ones, whom he preferred before the Latin ones, as he himself affirms in his Treatise of *Natures*.

BERTRAM's Latin style is polite enough for the Age he wrote in, and I find but one Greek word in his whole Treatise, and which he alleges only because 'tis found in a passage of *S. Isidor* which he cited. Whereas *John Scot* affects a Greek phrase and manner of speaking, and intermixes his Latin with a great many Greek words, which render his style very singular and difficult, as it has been observed by *Anastasius* the Library Keeper, and *Petrus Crinitus*.

*Epist. ad Card. Calv. in Syll. Epist. Hiber. De Honest. dis. l. 24. c. 11.*

*BERTRAM* has no barbarous words, whereas *John Scot* seems to affect them.

T. 1. *Marg.*  
p. 109. 111.  
*Ibid.* p. 112,  
113.

*BERTRAM* makes use only of Authors known for Orthodox, *John Scot* declares that he will not scruple to borrow Arms from heretical Books.

*BERTRAM* pertinently cites all along the holy Fathers, whereas the other quotes them with much less coherence.

*De Natur. l. 5.*  
p. 343.

*BERTRAM* has a particular deference for *S. Augustin*, as may be seen at the end of the Book of our Lords Body and Blood; whereas *John Scot* does not so much matter his Authority, but that he often prefers the Greek Fathers before him, refuting *S. Augustin* by their Authority.

T. 1. *Marg.*  
p. 111, 112.  
182.

*BERTRAM* might have combated the opinion of *Paschasius* by an infinite number of Arguments taken from Philosophy, which he does not do; whereas *John Scot* makes use every where of Philosophical Arguments even to the mixing of 'em with matters which seem to claim an exemption from 'em.

*Lib. 2. p. 75.*  
76. 99.

THAT which distinguishes 'em yet more is, that *Bertram* delivers himself in a most plain manner on the verity of the human nature of our Saviour, since 'twas exalted up into glory by the Resurrection. He teaches that his Body was visible and palpable, whereas *John Scot* in his Book of *Natures* defends the impalpability of our Lords Body; so that one may say, he fell into the error of *Origen* on this question.

*Lib. p. 17, 18.*  
20, 21, 22, 23,  
24. 25. 30. 35.  
37, 38, 39. 42.  
46, 47, 50. 56.  
*Lib. 2. p. 76.*  
*Lib. 2. p. 162.*  
178.  
*Lib. 4. p. 292.*  
297. 300. 306,  
3. 7.  
*Lib. 5. p. 343.*  
345. 348. 350.  
364.

I might moreover shew that *John Scot*, according to his genius and hypothesis, must without doubt have written in a quite different manner from what *Ratram* has done: and this is a remark which I made on an hundred places in his Manuscript Dialogue of *Nature*, when I read it. For he rejects therein almost all the consequences of *Paschasius* his Doctrin, in a very convincing manner, but yet very different from the method of *Bertram*. Here is an instance thereof; he maintains from the authority of *S. Maximus*, that bodies have no Blood when they are glorified, which does accommodate it self with the hypothesis of *John Damascen*, but not with those of the Real Prefence and Transubstantiation, as every body knows. Who doubts but he would have used this argument on this question? I might produce several others; but since this matter would carry me off too far, and that I have not the Manuscript by me, I shall therefore content my self with the remarks which I have made, believing them sufficient to shew, that the genius of *John Scot* was wholly different from *Bertram's*.

## CHAP. V.

*Other Difficulties which the Author of the Dissertation forms on the Name of Bertram, Examined.*

SEEING that the Book of our Lords Body and Blood is a piece of Ratram's, and not of John Scot, we shall not be apt to suppose, as the Author of the Dissertation does, that Berenger or his Disciples first publish'd this Writing under the name of Bertram. And truly it is a hard matter to know the commendations which Hildebert Bishop of Mans, and since Arch Bishop of Tours has given Berenger, and to fall into a suspicion so injurious to the memory of this great man. Hildebert describes Berenger as a person

*Cujus cura sequi naturam, legibus uti  
Et mentem vitiis, ora negare dolis.  
Virtutes opibus, verum præponere falso.*

A man that follows these Maxims, and those who are taught by him, are far enough from all manner of deceit. I need only then shew that supposing Bertram's Book were John Scot's, the effect would not cease to be near upon the same, because John Scot has been a man of great note, and authority in the 9th. Century. But because our Author imagins that the name of Bertram, under which this Book has first appeared, proves clearly that it is not Ratram's, it is fitting before this to consider his Observations,

THE first of which amounts to this, that Sigebert, Trithemius, and Cellot's Anonymous, which are the only Authors who have spoken of Ber- Dissert. Art. 3:  
sect. 3. tram, attribute to him no other works, than those of the Body and Blood of our Lord, and of Predestination, of which, these two first Authors make no mention, in speaking of John Scot, altho it be most certain that John Scot has written two Books on these same subjects; whence he concludes that Bertram is a fictitious Author, which at bottom is no other than John Scot. Thus does the Author of the Dissertation argue.

BUT there is nothing solid in this remark. First, The Book of John Scot of Predestination is dedicated to Hincmar, and Pardulus; whereas Sigebert remarks expressly that that of Bertram, or of Ratram, was dedicated to Charles the Bald, as we see in effect in the Impression of this Book of Ratram, which Mr. Mauguin has publish'd. Secondly, Trithemius confirms in two places the Text of Sigebert, altho in another place he says also that Bertram's Book of the Body and Blood of our Lord was dedicated to Charles, which Sigebert was silent in. Thirdly, It is false that Cellot's Anonymous had the name of Bertram, he has always Ratram's in the Manuscript of Corbie; and in the two Manuscripts of the Abby of S. Victor we find that in one place this Anonymous gives for adversaries to Paschasius, Rabanus and Intramus, and in the following page Babanus and Ratramnus, neither in one nor in the other of these two places has the Transcriber the name of Bertram, which would be strange if the Title which this Book has had since the 11th. Century were that of Bertram, and not that of Ratram, as we affirm. Fourthly, It is false that Authors speak but of two pieces



De Script. Eccl.  
fol. 57. & in  
chron. Hirsau.

pieces attributed to *Bertram*: *Trithemius* says in two places that *Bertram* wrote several other Books. Fifthly, The silence of the Anonymous is impertinently alledged touching the other works of *Bertram*, seeing he has not the name of *Bertram*, and should he have had the name, his drift would not carry him to speak of any other Writing of *Bertram*, but that of the Eucharist. Sixthly, If *Sigebert* mention'd not the Book of the Eucharist which *John Scot* wrote by the order of *Charles the Bald*, there can be nothing concluded hence unless it may be affirm'd by the same reason, that his other works, as that of *Natures*, have been attributed to other Authors. Seventhly, There is nothing more natural than to say that *Trithemius* has comprehended the Books of *Predestination*, and of the Eucharist of *John Scot*, when he says *Joannes dictus Erigena scripsit quædam alia*.

*Ibidem.*

*Dissert. ibid.*

THE second remark of this Author is, that those who speak of *Bertram*, do not know him particularly, nor agree about his true name; that *Sigebert* who in some Manuscript Copies calls him *Ratram*, does not denote the quality he had, which he is wont to do in speaking of other Authors; that the Abbot *Trithemius* who speaks of *Bertram* in three places, could not say in what Diocess, nor in what Monastery he made himself so famous, altho he always made these kind of remarks in speaking of th' Illustrious men of the order of *S. Bennet*, so that there's reason to believe that he too lightly made the *Elogium* of *Bertram*, whose works were apparently unknown to him; in fine, that the Anonymous who designs the other Authors by their qualities, as *Raban*, *Heribold*, *Paschasus*, *Egilon* speaks of *Ratram* as of an unknown person, *Ratramnus quidam*, denoting that he knew nothing of him, but that his name was *Ratram*, or *Intram*, as speak the Manuscripts of the Abby of *S. Victor*.

BUT our Author is mistaken in his suppositions. First, It is not true *Sigebert* gives constantly to the Writers, of which he speaks, the Ecclesiastical qualifications they had, the contrary appears from the 84. 91. 93. 94. 103. and other Chapters of his Catalogue. Secondly, I know not what *Trithemius* was wont to do in his second Book of Writers of the Order of *S. Bennet*, I never saw this work. Yet the little certainty which I found in the judgment of our Author, on the custom of *Sigebert*, makes me believe that he has not judged better of that of *Trithemius*. In the main, I am not greatly solicitous whether *Trithemius* has seen, or not seen the Writings which he attributes to *Bertram*. Yet I cannot but observe here the vanity of mens judgments. In 1652. the Elogies which *Trithemius* gives to *Bertram*, oblige Mr. *Herman* to believe, that the Book of the *Body and Blood of our Lord*, is the most Orthodox piece in the world. And in 1669. these same commendations which *Trithemius* gives to *Bertram*, oblige the Author of the *Dissertation* to affirm that *Trithemius* never read it, and so prais'd *Bertram* without any consideration. Thirdly, It seems to me that the manner after which *Cellet's* Anonymous has treated *Ratram*, not knowing him, but by his Book, makes him not an Author unknown to others. For supposing *Ratram* were entirely unknown to this Anonymous, who lived in the 12th. Century, we know that *Florus* the famous Deacon of the Church of *Lyons* was likewise treated no better than a *quidam* by the Historians of the 12th. and 13th. Century, and *Paschasus* himself was so little known by *Gaudefredus* the Monk of *Claravod*, at the end of the 12th. Century, that *Gaudefredus* confounds him with *Paschasus* Deacon of the Roman Church, who lived about the year 500. *Amalaris* was very famous in the 9th. Cen-

*Hieron. ab ang.  
Forti Epist. 3.  
P. 63.*

*Guil. Malmsh.  
A. 883.  
Sim. Dunelm,  
p. 148  
Math. Westm.  
ann. 889. apud  
Baron. A. 1118.  
fol. 29.*

9th. Century, and well known by *Lewis the Debonnair*, by whose order he wrote. The Transcribers have corrupted his name in the Catalogue of *Sigebert*, and turned it into *Attularius*; *Trithemius* speaks of him in his Catalogue under the name of *Hamularius*, and after an hundred Disputes he remains still in a manner unknown. Fourthly, It is surprizing enough to see the Author of the *Dissertation* attributing to the Authors themselves the faults of the Transcribers, who have written the name of *Ratram*. He tells us that *Sigebert* gives to *Bertram* the name of *Ratram* in some Manuscript Copies, that *Trithemius* speaks of him under three different names, of *Bertram*, of *Bertramnus*, and of *Bertrannus*, that the Anonymous Author calls him *Ratramnus*, or *Intram*: I know not whether he speaks in good earnest, or to deride us: But if he speaks seriously that those who according to his supposition changed the Title of the Book of *John Scot*, made it pass on purpose under these different names in different Copies 'twould have been good before a conjecture of this kind was offered, to undertake the confirming of this discovery by the Authority of some Manuscripts of *the Body and Blood of our Lord*, wherein might be seen these different names.

See Labb. of  
Writ Ecclis.  
In Amalar.

THE last mark of the supposition which the Author of the *Dissertation* offers is, that if we will not acknowledg *Bertram* for a feign'd Author, and the Book of *the Body and Blood of our Lord* for the work of *John Scot*, we shall find our selves forced to admit such strange consequences, and which approach so near to impossibilities, that the like cannot be parallel'd by all Antiquity.

BUT we need only to run thro the principal difficulties which our Author proposes to find that all this is nothing. First, It is not an absurdity to pretend that in the 9th. Century there were two Authors, one named *John Scot*, known of all the world for the Author of the first Translation of the Hierarchy of the feign'd *Denys* into Latin: The other called *Ratramnus*, whose name thro the ignorance of Transcribers, was corrupted into that of *Bertram*, or *Bertramnus*, or *Bertran*, as that of *Amalarius* has been into *Attularius*, that of *Aimoinus* into *Aumoinus*, *Ammonius* and *Annonius*, under which this Author was first publish'd at *Paris* in the year 1514. Secondly, Neither is it any more an absurdity to say they were both of 'em adversaries to *Paschasus*, not secret, as our Author affirms, but open ones, in writing against his Doctrin. The Anonymous Author mentions several adversaries of *Paschasus*, as *Raban* and *Ratramnus*. Thirdly, It is not so monstrous an impossibility to maintain that *Ratramnus* and *John Scot* wrote both of 'em on the subject of the Eucharist, and on Predestination: There were in their times two Disputes on these subjects, and in effect we have their two Treatises of Predestination, publish'd by Mr. *Manguin*. We know that in the 11th. Century the Popes burnt *John Scot's* on the Eucharist, and without doubt their partisans who suppress'd all *Berenger's* Books, and those of his Disciples, have likewise exterminated with the greatest care the Copies of that of *John Scot*. By good hap that of *Ratramnus*, who is mention'd in the 12th. Century, as an adversary to *Paschasus*, is yet extant, under the corrupted name of *Bertram*. Fourthly, Neither is there any absurdity to conceive that the Writings of these two Authors touching the Eucharist have been, the one dedicated to King *Charles the Bald*, and the other composed by his Order. *Ratramnus* and *John Scot* were both of 'em particularly known and esteem'd by this Prince. *Ratramnus* has written by his Order the Book of *Predestination*, and *John Scot* in obedience to his Commands has

tran-

translated the Hierarchy of the pretended *Denys*, and was always greatly esteem'd by him. Fifthly, It is not absurd to believe that *John Scot* was oblig'd to write on the same subject as *Ratramnus*; their judgment was so considerable in their time, that *Hincmar* and *Pardulus*, two famous Bishops, oblig'd *John Scot* to write on Predestination, and an Assembly of Bishops oblig'd *Ratramnus* to write against the objections of the Greeks, which Pope *Nicholas* had sent them. Sixthly, It is an imaginary difficulty to say they have both of 'em had the fancy to give to *Charles the Bald*, the Title of *Charlemain*. I have shew'd that they have not done it; but that *Berenger* has been mistaken in explaining this Title *Ad Carolum Regem*: and that it is very possible those who Printed the Book of *Bertram* have understood this Title as *Berenger* did in a like subject, and in the same dispute. Seventhly, It is not an impossibility for two Books of the Body and Blood to contain each of 'em but one Book of a very indifferent size. Eighthly, There is no more difficulty to believe that two Writers who treat on the same subject have used the same Witnesses, the same Orison which was said every day in the Service, than that they have drawn the same conclusions, and in terms perhaps not absolutely the same, but very near one another. *Paschasus* bragged in his Letter to *Frudegard*, that this Orison was made for him, which caused all his Adversaries to examin it, and urge the proper terms of it against him, without changing any thing therein. Neither do I any more believe that after what I have represented of the genius of these Authors, any body will imagin they were both of 'em equally addicted to *Aristotle's* Philosophy, and were both wont to illustrate the mysteries of Religion by Arguments put in form, by Enthymemes, by Maxims and Principles drawn from Philosophy: I have shew'd the difference which there is between the genius of *Bertram* and that of *John Scot*. Tenthly, It is equally false that neither of 'em dared to discover their minds touching the Real Presence. Our Author himself will have *Bertram's* Book to be *John Scot's*, and *John Scot's* Book was burn'd in a full Council, because it opposes it. Eleventhly, There is no great matter of wonder that after the question was moved, and the Book of *John Scot* burn'd, there should be more diligent search made after the Books which respected a Dispute touching which *Berenger* maintain'd that *Paschasus* gave the occasion by his novelties, and thus the Book of *Ratram* has appear'd since that of *John Scot* has disappear'd.

IN fine, twelfthly, There are no rational people that will be perplexed with this imaginary difficulty of the Author of the *Dissertation*, to wit, that of one of these Authors, which is *Bertram*, there should remain nothing that is certain to posterity, neither in respect of his quality, nor his name, altho his Book has remain'd, and that the quality of the other, to wit, *John Scot*, should be well known, altho his Book be lost. It is apparent enough who *Ratramnus* was, and that *Bertram* is but a name corrupted thro the ignorance of the Transcribers. But what I now represented is sufficient to dissipate the illusion, which the name of *Bertram* had produced, and all reasonable people will be fully convinced that *Ratram* is the Author of the Book of *the Body and Blood of our Lord*, and not *John Scot*. We have only then to shew that the authority of this Book will be of no less weight, supposing *John Scot* were the Author of it. For which purpose I have design'd the second part of this Answer.



## THE SECOND PART.

That the Authority of the Book of *the Body and Blood of our Lord*, Publish'd under the Name of *Bertram*, will be never the less considerable, supposing *John Scot* were the Author of it.

## CHAP. VI.

*That John Scot was in great esteem both in his own, and succeeding Generations.*

THERE are so many things which advance the repute of *John Scot*, that one may well wonder Mr. *Arnaud* and the Author of the *Dissertation* should mention him with such lessening terms, and persuade themselves, that to diminish the credit of the Book of *the Body and Blood of our Lord*, they needed only to attribute it to *John Scot*. For he was a person who by his merit had gain'd the esteem and affection of *Charles the Bald*, which is to say, of a judicious Prince, who took to heart the interests of Religion; as *Ratramn* praises him in his Book of *Predestination*. *These two things*, says he, *exalt your Majesty, in a manner really illustrious. That you seek after the secrets of the heavenly Wisdom, and burn with Religious Zeal*. And indeed this Prince deserv'd the Title of *Orthodox* which was given him by a Council held in 869. *Henry* a Monk of *Auxerre* praises him also for his knowledg, and piety, as we see in the Epistle Dedicatory in the Life of *S. Germain* of *Auxerre*, related by *Du Chene*, and *Baronius*. But amongst other things he commends him for having drawn over into *France*, *Learned Ireland*, meaning thereby *John Erigena*, that is to say, *John* the Irish man, according to the Observation of *Alford* the Jesuit in his *English Annals*.

T. 1. *Maug.*  
P. 29.  
Concil. apud  
Vermer. T. 2.  
Nov. Bibl. Mss.  
p. 735.  
Hist. Fr. T. 1.  
P. 470.  
Annal. 876.  
Hist. 3. 39.  
T. 3. A. 886.  
Hist. 12, 11.

HE that wrote the lives of the Bishops of *Auxerre*, describing the advantages which *Heribald* had in his Youth, reckons for a great happiness that he was brought up under the tuition of *John Scot*. *He applied himself*, says he, *to John Scot who in that time imparted to the Gauls the Rays of his Wisdom*. *He was a long time his Disciple, and learn'd from him the art of knowing divine and human things, and to judg rightly of good and evil*.

T. 2. *Nov. Bib.*  
Mss. P. 4: 5.

THE Authority of *John Scot* was so considerable in the 9th. Century, that *Hincmar* Arch-Bishop of *Reims*, and *Pardulus*, Bishop of *Laon*, who found themselves engaged in sharp Disputes touching Predestination and Grace with *Gottfrescalc*, believ'd they could not do better for their party than to oblige *John Scot* to write on these two subjects. He did so in effect, and altho the choice which he made of the worst side, drew on him the censures of the Councils of *Valence* and *Langres*, and that *Hincmar* himself defended him

T. 2. *Maug.*  
132.

him but weakly, yet did he keep up his credit, and *Charles the Bald* set him upon translating the works which bear the name of *Denis the Areopagite*.

syl. Epist.  
Hybr. n. 33.  
p. 64. & seq.

HIS Reputation maintain'd it self not only in *France*, but pass'd over into *Italy*, and *Rome* it self. *Anastasius* the Popes Library-keeper gives him particular Commendations in a Letter which he wrote to *Charles the Bald*. I speak, says he, of *John Scot*, of whom I have heard say, that he is a Saint. It is a work of the Spirit of God to have made this man so zealous as well as eloquent.

WE may likewise here add the kindness which *Alfred King of England* had for him, and the Employs which this Prince gave him; but of this I shall discourse hereafter.

I shall only say that *John Scot* was in effect, worthy of the esteem and affection which the world shewed him, his Wit was lively and piercing; he was not only a profound Philosopher, but also very well read in the Fathers, and especially the Greek ones, which was very rare in the 9th. Century, wherein the learning of the greatest men was bounded by the knowledge of *S. Hierom*, *S. Augustin*, *Gregory the Great*, *Isidor of Sevil*: and their skill lay in copying out these Authors word for word.

Part 3, ch. 3.

IN fine, we may moreover observe in favour of *John Scot*, that altho his Book of the Eucharist, was condemned in the Councils of the 11th. Century, yet the reputation of the Author was perpetuated in the following Ages, as appears from the authentick Testimonies, which all Historians give him. I shall not relate here what *Ingulphus*, *William of Malmsbury*, *Simeon of Durham*, *Roger de Hoveden*, *Matthew of Westminster*, and *Florent of Worcester* have said of him: we may find this in the Answer to the first Treatise of the Perpetuity.

De honesta  
Discipl. 14.  
c. 11.  
Gener. p. 30.

WE need only add to these testimonies, First, that of the Manuscript of the Library of *S. Victor*, which has for Title, *Memoriale Historiarum: Tempore eodem fuit Joannes Scotus vir perspicacis ingenii & mellitæ facundia qui rogatu Caroli Calvi jamdudum verbo ad verbum Hierarcham Dionysii de Græco in Latinum transtulerat, & post super eundem librum fecit commentum, fecitque librum de naturæ divisione, & librum de Eucharistiâ, qui postea lectus est, & condemnatus in Synodo Vercellensi à Papa Leone celebrata, eodem anno quo Lanfrandus ab errore Berengarii se purgavit, unde, sicut dicit Lanfrandus, ipse in fide desipuit. Tandem ivit in Angliam ad Regem Elfredum, & apud Monasterium Malmsburiense à pueris quos docebat, & à graphiis suis, ut fertur, perforatus martyr æstimatus est.* Secondly, That of *Petrus Crinitus*, who speaks of him in almost the same terms. Thirdly, That of *Naucler*, *Alfred*, says he, had enriched the College of Oxford, especially with *John Scot*, as with a Divine Star, which he drew over into England from France, where he was in favour with *Charles the Bald*.

If there needs any thing more to confirm the reputation of our Author, we shall scarcely find any one to whom there can be given any authority.

IT is true that his Book of the Eucharist was condemned by the Roman Church in the 11th. Century; but it is remarkable that neither this Book nor its Author were condemned in the 9th. Century, wherein he lived, and

and that his adversaries who were greatly enraged against him, as appears by the Letter of the Church of *Lyons*, and the terms of the Council of *Valence*, and which consequently was not in a condition to pardon him a Heresie on the subject of the holy Sacrament, yet did not accuse him on this Article. *Celot* the Jesuit being not willing to agree concerning the true reason why in that time they did not reproach *John Scot* about the Doctrine of the Eucharist, turns the business into admiration, and offers a pitiful reason of this silence; *I cannot sufficiently wonder*, says he, *that leaving the error which John Scot was said to hold touching the Eucharist; these* Append. ad Hist. Gothesc. p. 583. *dreams* (for thus does he call those of *Lyons*) *should only apply themselves to the subject of Predestination. This shews*, adds he, *that they did not matter so much the defending of the Faith, as the ruining the Party of those of Reims; which is to say of Hincmar and his friends, who had condemned Gottescalc.* But both his astonishment and reason too would equally vanish, if he would have taken notice of what every one sees, that the true cause why *John Scot* was not condemned in the 9th. Century, but in the 11th. was, that his belief was conformable to that of the Church of the 9th. Age, and became not otherwise till afterwards when the followers of *Paschasius* prevail'd.

THE Author of the *Dissertation* has taken another course to fully the fame of *John Scot's* name, and gives a reason why his Book touching the Eucharist was not condemned in the 9th. Century. He says there is in the Library of *S. Germain des prés* two Manuscripts of a Dialogue, entituled, *Of Natures*, the Author of which is this same *John Scot*, and that this Book is full of Errors. He discourses on these Errors with the greatest art and care, and draws from 'em these two consequences. 1. *That John Scot was a man very likely to invent Heresies contrary to the Doctrine of the Church of his time.* 2. *We must not be astonish'd that Heresies, having been only taught by a particular person, who had no followers, that the Book wherein he taught them should not be publickly condemned.* And this is what he believes the Dialogue of *Natures* doth invincibly shew, because that on one hand it is full of Errors, and on the other, we do not find it was condemned. Artic. 1. of his Dissert. on John Scot.

AS to the first, I freely acknowledg this Book is *John Scot's*, and that there are Errors in it; but the Author of the *Dissertation* ought not to conceal that *John Scot* did not offer 'em of his own head, but herein only follow'd the opinions of several famous Fathers amongst the Greeks and Latins, as *S. Basil*, *S. Gregory of Nyssa*, and *S. Ambrose*, the pretended *Denis the Areopagite*, and *S. Maximus*; which does not hinder but these Fathers have been always in great veneration in the Church. *John Scot* cites them on each of these opinions, he sets down their passages; which made *William of Malmesbury* to say, *That his Book may profitably serve to resolve difficult questions, provided he be excused in some things, in which he has wandred from the way of the Latins, by reason of his following too much the Greeks.*

AS to the second consequence there is a great deal of difference between the Book of *John Scot of Natures*, and that of the Eucharist of the same Author. First, The Book of *Natures* perhaps has not been known but to few persons, because 'twas wrote at the entreaty of a particular person, to wit of *Wulfadus Canon of Rheims*, whereas that which he wrote on the Eucharist must needs have been publick, seeing he wrote by order of *Charles the Bald*, and in a time wherein the novelties of *Paschasius* had ex-



cited much clamour in the Church. Secondly, Altho the Book of *Natures* had been known, the errors which are therein contain'd being of the Fathers, whose names are venerable in the Church, we must not think it strange that they were spared out of respect to the Fathers, for whom the world has ever had so great a veneration and condescension, altho they have not approved all their sentiments. But supposing the Church ever believed Transubstantiation, and the Real Presence, the error broach'd and maintain'd by *John Scot* in the Book of the Eucharist contrary to these two Articles, would have been his only, and not the Fathers, and consequently nothing would have hindred the world from exercising the greatest severity against *John Scot's* Book, and openly condemning it. Thirdly, The errors which are in the Book of *Natures* are speculative errors in matters out of the common road and reach of sense; whereas that of the Book of the Eucharist would have been a particular error on a Sacrament, which is continually before the eyes of Christians; for supposing, as I said, the Church of that time had believ'd Transubstantiation and the Real Presence, as the Roman Church believes them at this day, and adored the Sacrament as the proper Son of God Incarnate, the error of *John Scot* would have overthrow the Faith and Rites of all Christians, and would have had as many adversaries as there are persons in the Church: The King himself, by whose order he wrote, would have been interest'd to have condemn'd so pernicious a Book, to avoid the being suspected that he himself sowed Heresies by the borrow'd hand of *John Scot*. It is then evident that the two consequences of the Author of the *Dissertation* are insufficient to diminish or efase the reputation and authority of *John Scot's* name: and thus when the Book which bears the name of *Bertram*, should be in effect of *John Scot*, this Book would not cease to be of great weight and great authority.

## C H A P. VII.

*An Examination of what the Author of the Dissertation alleges  
against the Employs of John Scot.*

**T**HE Author of the *Dissertation* finding himself disturb'd with the several testimonies which Historians give *John Scot*, has thought good to fall foul on 'em and maintain these four things: First, That *John Scot* was neither the Disciple of Venerable *Bede*, nor the Companion of *Alcuinus*, nor the Founder of the University of *Paris*. Secondly, That he was not Abbot of *Etheling* in *England*. Thirdly, That the History of his Martyrdom is uncertain. Fourthly, That he has not been put in the rank of Martyrs by the Authority of the Supreme Prelates, and that his name is not to be found in any Edition of the Roman Martyrology.

Art. 4, 5, 6, 7.  
of his Dissert.  
on *John Scot*.

Artic. 4.

FOR the first of these Articles, I know not why the Author of the *Dissertation* should trouble himself about it; seeing Mr. *Claude* mention'd nothing like it in his discourse of *John Scot*. We know that *Bede* died in 735. that *Alcuinus* died in 804, and that *John Scot* was living in the year 870. We acknowledg also that *John Scot* could not be the Founder of the Univer-

University of *Paris*, seeing that this University did not begin till about the middle of the 12th. Century, as all learned men are agreed. Yet can it not be deny'd but that those who fell into these mistakes, (to wit, of making *John Scot Bede's* Disciple the Companion of *Alcuinus*, and the Founder of the University of *Paris*, by seeing the name of *John Scot* so famous and renowned amongst Authors) would advance by the fame of his person the Original of th' University of *Paris*, which helps to establish his Reputation and Authority, and to combat in general the pretensions of the Author of the *Dissertation*.

AS to the second Article wherein our Author maintains that *John Erigenus* was not Abbot of *Ætheling*, Mr. *Claude* contented himself with saying in general, *That he was made in England Abbot of a Monastery of the Royal Foundation*. *Ingulphus* says the same, and remarks in particular that this Monastery was that of *Ætheling*.

SO that here we have at least Mr. *Claude's* sincerity secured. *Harsfield* Sect. 9. cap. 12. and *Cellot* the Jesuit have related as well as he, the testimony of *Ingulphus*; and I know not why he might not make use of it as well as these Authors who are of the Roman Church. *Append. ad Hist. Goth. p. 885.*

I confess 'tis somewhat difficult<sup>22</sup> to determin precisely whether the testimony of *Ingulphus* be absolutely true, when he says *Alfred* gave the Abby of *Ætheling* to *John Scot*; for I know there are Authors who deny that *John* the Abbot of *Ætheling* was the same *John Scot* whom we mean. We will see presently what are the reasons which the Author of the *Dissertation* brings to prove that these are two different persons; yet howsoever, 'tis true in general Authors agree that *John Scot*, the same we speak of, was received very kindly by King *Alfred*, and had a very considerable employ in *England*, when he retired thither; which is sufficient to keep up his Reputation, and shew he was in no sort respected as an Heretick, who withstood the constant and universal Faith of the Church.

MORE OVER, the reasons which the Author of the *Dissertation* offers to oppose the testimony of *Ingulphus*, who will have *John Scot* to be Abbot of *Ætheling*, are very slight ones, and fall short of convincing or persuading. He agrees there was one *John* who was made Abbot of *Ætheling*, but will have him to be another than our *John Scot*. His first proof is, that *John* Abbot of *Ætheling* was of the County of *Essex*, which is to say, of the County of the Western Saxons, whereas the other was an Irish man.

BUT this proof is a very weak one; for these terms, *Ex Saxonum genere*, as speak *Afferus* and *Roger de Howden*, or, *Ex antiqua Saxoniam oriundum*, as speaks *William of Malmsbury*, are not inconsistent with the surname of *Scot*, or *Erigenus*; that is to say, Irish man. Nothing can hinder but that he might have been originally from the County of *Essex* and an Irish man by the abode which he made in *Ireland*. It may happen that our French men have spoken less exact of the true Country of *John Scot*, than *Afferus* has done, who knew him more particularly. In effect *Harsfield* Will have *John Scot* to be surnamed Irish man, only on the account of the abode which he made in *Ireland*, where he had been brought up, but was really an English man; and of the Country of *Essex*. We know that the sur-

urnames of Countries have been ever given to divers persons, by reason of the abode which they made therein. *Cicero* gives two Countries to every man, one the Country where he is born, and the other the Country which has favourably received him. When once this last kind of surnames is become as proper, one retains 'em till death, and after it; which is not inconsistent with what may be said moreover of the Country wherein a man is born. And therefore *Ingulphus* who first decied the Text of *Afferus*, did not believe that for this pretended difference of the name of Irish man, and of the Country of *Essex*, a man ought to make two *John Scots*, the one a Saxon, and the other an Irish man. *Similiter*, says he, *de veteri Saxonia Joannem cognomento Scotum accerrimi ingenii Philosophum ad se alliciens, Adelungiae Monasterii sui constituit Prælatum*. When he says, *De veteri Saxonia Joannem cognomento Scotum*; he shews sufficiently that there is not according to him any inconsistency in making him of the Country of *Essex*, and yet giving him the surname of Irish; the one designing the Country of his Birth, and the other that of his Abode. The Author of the *Dissertation* tells us that *Ingulphus* has suffered himself to be imposed on by some Impostor, who was affection'd to *John Scot*. What is this but a mere conjecture in the Air, which has neither proof nor ground, nor any appearance of truth?

THE second proof of our Author is taken from that he pretends *John Scot* withdrew into *England* to avoid the shame which he endured of being reputed an Heretick in *France*, whereas *John Abbot of Ætheling* was sent for over into *England* by a messenger from *Alfred*.

THIS proof is no more conclusive than the rest: For first, *Ingulphus* overthrows this pretended occasion of the retreat of *John Scot* into *England*, by saying that *Alfred* drew him over to him. The first who supposed this cause of his retreat was *Simeon of Durham*, or *William of Malmesbury*, of whom the Author of the *Dissertation* says *Simeon* has borrow'd it. Now *William of Malmesbury* wrote a long time since *Ingulphus*; others have follow'd *Simeon of Durham*, without examining whether what he said was well grounded or not. So that all their testimonies do reduce themselves to that of one man, posterior to *Ingulphus*, and who consequently by all the laws of History cannot be preferred before him. Secondly, These same Historians who will have the cause of *John Scot's* retreat into *England* to be an effect of the displeasure which he had to be accused of Heresie by his adversaries, yet do acknowledg that he was drawn over thither by *Alfred*, *Cujus munificentia illectus, & magisterio ejus, ut ex Scriptis Regis intellexi, Melduni resedit*, says *Simeon of Durham*, which is to say, that he was won by the Kings liberality, to be his Tutor. *Roger de Howden* and *Matthew of Westminster* say the same thing in the same terms: so that according to them these two things do not contradict one another, that *John Scot* was call'd into *England* by *Alfred*, and yet came thither thro some disgust which his enemies had given him in *France*.

THIRDLY, French Historians say also that *John Scot* was called over into *England* by *Alfred*. Observe here what an ancient Chronicle of *France* says which ends in 1137. At the entreaty of *Alfred*, *John Scot* return'd from *France*, where he was with *Charles the Bald*. But fourthly, If we suppose that this *John Scot*, whom the Historians say was fetcht over from *France* into *England*, together with *S. Grimbald*, by an Ambassador, sent



sent on purpose by *Alfred* for him, is different from our *John Scot*; it cannot be said who he was, *Afferus* speaks of him; not as of an obscure person, but as a famous man. *The King*, says he, *sent beyond Sea into France Embassadors, to search for Masters, and drew over Grimbald a Priest and a Monk; he brought over likewise John, who was also a Priest and a Monk, a man of a great wit, and well vers'd in all Sciences.* Let us be inform'd who this famous man was in *France*, this man that was so well known, and deserved to be sent for by an Embassage? For we do not any where find there was in *France* after the middle of the 9th. Century any other man of this Character, and name of *John*, but *John Scot*. We find indeed mention made of *Grimbald*, that he was a Monk of *S. Bertin*, who understood Musick, but was far from equalling in Wit and Learning this *John Scot*, of whom *Afferus* speaks. How then came it to pass that there remains no trace of this pretended *John*, supposing this was not he.

THE Author of the *Dissertation's* third foundation is, that *John Scot* withdrew from *France* into *England* about the year 864. whereas *John Scot* the Abbot of *Ætheling*, companion of *S. Grimbald* came over there but in 884. But why must *John Scot* have pass'd over from *France* into *England*, about the year 864. *Because*, says our Author, *Nicholas the First, pray'd Charles the Bald to send him speedily John Scot, or at least to suffer him no longer to remain in his University of Paris, lest he should corrupt it with his Errors.* Hinc est quod dilectioni vestræ vehementer rogantes mandamus, quatenus Apostolatui nostro Joannem repræsentari faciatis, aut certe Parisius in Studio, cujus jam olim Capital fuisse perhibetur, morari non sinatis, ne cum tritico sacri eloquii grana Lolii & Zizaniæ miscere dignoscatur; & panem quærentibus, venenum porrigat. 'Twas without doubt, adds our Author, after these Letters that *John Scot* withdrew into *England*. Seeing then *Pope Nicolas* has govern'd the Church since the year 858, till 868. We must place th' arrival of *John Scot* into *England* about the year 864. that is to say, twenty years before *Alfred* caus'd *Grimbald* and *John* to come to him. For *Affer* assures us this was in the year 884.

THIS reasoning supposes facts which are not proved. First, This fragment of the Letter of *Nicolas I.* to *Charles the Bald*, wherein is mention of *John Scot* and the University of *Paris*, is a piece supposed a great while after the 9th. Century; for the University of *Paris*, as I have already observ'd, began not before the 12th. Century; and these terms of *Studium* and of *Capital*, to express the University and Rector of it, were not in use in *Nicolas I.* his time. Secondly, The Author of the *Dissertation* informs us that the Letter of *Anastasius* the Popes Library-keeper to *Charles the Bald*, of which we have already spoken, was written in the year 875. and proves it by a Manuscript of the Jesuits of *Bourges*, which bears expressly this date. Now in this Letter *Anastasius* gives singular commendations to *John Scot*, calling him *virum per omnia sanctum*; what likelihood is there then, *Anastasius* would give praises of this kind to a man who was esteem'd at *Rome* an Heretick, and was oblig'd for this reason, and the Popes accusation, to withdraw from the Court of *Charles*?

OUR Author impertinently supposes from the testimony of *Afferus*, that *John* the Abbot of *Ætheling* pass'd not over into *England* till 884. Had he read *Afferus* with a little more reflection, he would have found that altho *Afferus* refers the sending for of *Grimbald* and *John*, to the year 884. yet

yet does he not thereby intend precisely to fix it to the year 884. *Asserus* recapitulates on the year 884. the private life of *Alfred*, since the year 868. which was the year of his Marriage, omitting several important things that he might not interrupt the narration of the Wars of this Prince, even as in the year 868. he had recapitulated whatsoever *Alfred* had done during his youth. So *Asserus* does not say in *that year*, as he must have done if he would have precisely design'd the year 884. but he says in *these times*, *his temporibus*.

THE fourth proof of the Author of the *Dissertation* is no better than the rest. He says that Mr. *Claude* having written that *John Scot* died in the year 884. or in the preceding year, he could not be this *John* whom *Alfred* the King of *England* sent for by reason of his Reputation and Learning, seeing that this *John* was not made Abbot till the year 888. or 887. as all Historians agree, and that he began not his regency at *Oxford* till the year 886. as we find in the Annals of the Monastery of *Winchester*, of which *Grimbald* was made Abbot at the same time as *John* his companion, was of that of *Ætheling*.

BUT there's no solidity in this proof: First, It is plain one cannot gather any thing certain from Historians, either touching the year of *John Scot*'s death, nor that wherein *Alfred* called *Grimbald* and *John* into *England*. Secondly, Neither is there any certainty in the Annals of *Winchester*, which refer to the year 886. the foundation of the University of *Oxford* by *Grimbald*, and *John* his companion two years after their arrival in *England*; for this so great an antiquity of the University of *Oxford* is a mere fable, as has been proved by Bishop *Usher*: so that whatsoever can be reasonably concluded hence is, that there being nothing certain in all this Chronology, there can be nothing alledged hence to conclude that *John Scot* died in the year 883. or 884. And consequently the conjecture of Mr. *Claude* (who has only in this respect follow'd *Baronius* may be respected as doubtful.) But to conclude hence that *John Scot*, and *John* the Abbot of *Ætheling* were two different persons, is very absurd.

AFTER all, two things clearly enough shew that this whole criticism of the Author of the *Dissertation*, who puts a difference between *John Scot* and *John* the Abbot of *Ætheling*, is merely imaginary, and that in effect they are but one and the same person. The first is, That amongst the persons of the 9th. Century who were in any wise famous in *France*, we find no mention of this pretended *John*, whom *Alfred* sent for. The other, that 'tis evident *Asserus* (who was Contemporary of *John Scot*) has made no mention of him, if *John Scot* were not the Abbot of *Ætheling*, which is very strange, seeing it cannot be denied but *John Scot* was a most famous man, much respected by *Alfred*, and consequently well known to *Asserus*, who lived in the same Court.

IF we consider these two reasons with an unbiaſſed mind, I am persuaded they will be found stronger than all the conjectures of our Author. It is true one may yet form a difficulty which our Author has not taken notice of, which is, that *Asserus* seems to say this *John* of whom he speaks was Assassinated by his Monks at *Ætheling*, whereas *William* of *Malmsbury* and the Historians who follow'd him, assure us, that *John Scot* was kill'd by his Scholars at *Malmsbury*, and there interred. But it is certain there could be nothing

thing more easie than to confound the circumstance of the place wherein *John Scot* was assassinated, and take it for another, *William* of *Malmsbury*, who is the first of those who laid the Scene of this Tragedy at *Malmsbury*; recorded it near 250. years after it hapned. *Afferus* does not say *John Scot* died on the spot, and it will not seem impossible, that having been wounded at *Ætheling*, he was carried to *Malmsbury*, or dying at *Ætheling*, his body was carried thither, or having been Abbot of *Ætheling* and *Malmsbury* both together, as it was commonly the custom of that time, for one man to have several Abbies, this might give occasion to this difference. Howsoever it be, it is far more reasonable to conclude from the conformity of the relation of *Afferus* and *William* of *Malmsbury* touching the main of th' event, than from one only History, to make two by reason of some slight diversity which is between 'em on the circumstance of the place. And this seems the more likely, because, as I have already said, we have the formal testimony of *Ingulphus* an Historian of the 11th. Century, who assures us that this *John* the Abbot of *Ætheling* was no other but *John Scot*.

## C H A P. VIII.

*That John Scot was esteemed a Martyr.*

**I**T'S certain the death of *John Scot* was respected as a kind of Martyrdom, *Du Val* a Doctor of *Sorbon*, *Celso*, and *Alford* Jesuits, have maintain'd this against the unjust suspicions of *Genebrard*, and some others. Why then does the Author of the *Dissertation* pretend in his 6th. Article, that this Martyrdom is a thing doubtful.

T. 1. Mang.  
P. 739.  
Append. p. 583.  
Annal. Angl.  
Ann. 883.  
Sist. 41.

THERE be two sorts of proofs which confirm the truth of this; the one real, and the other verbal. The real is a stately Monument which was set up for him in the Church of *Malmsbury*, and was to be seen there before the 12th. Century with this Inscription.

Guill. Malmsb.  
de gest. Reg.  
Angl. l. 2. c. 4.  
p. 24.

*Clauditur hoc tumulo sanctus Sophista Joannes,  
Qui ditatus erat jam vivens dogmate miro,  
Martyrio tandem Christi conscendere regnum,  
Quo meruit; sancti regnant per secula cuncta.*

*William* of *Malmsbury* has well conjectured that these Verses were ancients than his time, *Scabri quidem*, says he, & *moderni temporis lima carentes*, sed *ab antiquo non ita deformes*.

TO this proof we must add the testimony of *Gotzelin* who has inserted *John* in his Catalogue of English Saints, which he made in the beginning of the 12th. Century, *S. Adelmus*, & *Joannes Sapiens in loco qui dicitur Adef. mibirig.*

Affer de success.  
Ecl. c. 2.

WHEREUNTO we may add the testimony of almost all Historians. 'Tis thus the continuer of *Bede* speaks, as also *William* of *Malmsbury*, *Simeon* of *Durham*, *Roger de Howden*, *Matthew* of *Westminster*, *Helinaud* the Monk

R r r r

of



of *Froidmond*, the Author of *Memoriale Historiarum* (whose passage I have related) *Vincent de Beauvais*, *Antonin* Arch-Bishop of *Florence*, *Baronius* and several other modern Authors that have follow'd them.

TO all which the Author of the *Dissertation* answers, that he acknowledges the holiness of this famous *John*, as well by the Epitaph spoken of by *William* of *Malmsbury*, and the Historians who have written after him, as by the Catalogue of *Gotzlin*; but denies this *John* to be the same *John Scot*. He pretends then that *William* of *Malmsbury*, who first attributed to *John Scot*, what agreed only to another *John* a Martyr, was to blame in doing it, that the Historians who followed *William* of *Malmsbury* ought not to have followed him, and that in effect *William* himself offers where-withal to refute what he himself says. To fortifie this conjecture he observes that the Martyrdom of *John Scot* was unknown to *Berenger*, and those of his Party, who could not have been ignorant of it, neither would have failed to take notice of it, especially since the condemnation of *John Scot* under *Nicolas II*. Whence he concludes that the fame of the Martyrdom of *John Scot* was dispersed up and down by his Disciples, and that this was not the sentiment of the Church in which *John Scot* died.

BUT there are few people who will remain satisfi'd with these conjectures of our Author. For first, If this *John* the Martyr of *Malmsbury* be not *John Scot*, who was he then? How comes it people have so universally lost the knowledge of him, since *William* of *Malmsbury* has confounded him with *John Scot*? Did he live before *John Scot*, or since? How could *William's* mistake cause all *England* to lose the knowledge of him? How comes it no body ever discovered the error of *William*? Whence is it that *William* himself could not meet with any thing to undeceive him, when he sought into the Antiquities of his Convent for the making his History? 'Tis very strange that in a matter of fact, a person who has written at *Paris* in 1669, should pretend to know better whose the Tomb was that was seen in the 12th. Century at *Malmsbury*, than *William* of *Malmsbury*, who lived in this same Convent, and who apparently omitted no enquiries for his satisfaction.

IT is probable that *William* was not the first Author who mention'd the Martyrdom of *John Scot*. For the continuer of *Bede*, whose Book was Printed at *Heidelberg* in 1587. formally mentions it, and the Author of the *Dissertation* believes that he who continued this work of *Bede* is different from *William*. I confess that *Vossius* has been mistaken in fixing this Author to the year 1080. seeing it is certain he lived till the beginning of the 12th. Century. But it does not follow from the error of *Vossius* that he was posterior to *William*. This Continuer clearly denotes that he was Contemporary to *Guitmond*, now *Guitmond* preceded *William* of *Malmsbury*; for this latter wrote in 1142. whereas the other died about the end of the 11th. Century, or at the beginning of the 12th. That if there be found several things alike in this Continuer, and in *William*, it is more reasonable to say that *William* has taken from the Continuer, than to say the Continuer has taken from *William*, and that the rather, because *William* has enlarged his History farther than the other by thirty years, which is the natural Character of a later Historian.

BUT

BUT supposing *William* of *Malmsbury* be the first who has spoken of the Martyrdom of *John Scot*, this does but the more confirm the truth of this History: for writing as he did in the very place, and in the same Convent wherein what he relates hapned, 'tis just to believe, that in this Narration he has offered nothing, but what was grounded on authentick Acts, or on a Tradition which in his time pass'd for an undeniable truth in this Convent.

IT is to no purpose for the Author of the *Dissertation* to distinguish what this *William* of *Malmsbury* has taken from the ancient Monuments of his Church, and what he has added thereunto of his own. He ought not thus to make of his own head this distinction on an Historian of the 12th. Century, and to tell us precisely, here's what he has taken from the Monuments of his Church; here's what he has added thereunto of his own: There was one *John* that suffered Martyrdom and was reputed a Saint; this is of the ancient Monuments of the Church of *Malmsbury*, but that this *John* was *John Scot*, is an addition of *William*. This distinction of our Author is bold enough, and was in effect unknown to *Simeon* of *Durham*, to *Roger de Howden*, to *Matthew* of *Westminster*, and to all those other Historians which I have already denoted, who all certainly believ'd, that the Martyrdom of *John Scot*, related by *William* of *Malmsbury*, was a truth of History which is beyond question.

HIS telling us that *William* was the first Historian who gave to King *Alfred* two Masters of the name of *John*, the one surnam'd the Saxon Abbot of *Ætheling*, the other surnam'd *Scot*, and since a Martyr. First, *William* does not say formally that this was two different men, *John* the Saxon, and *John Scot*, nor that one was surnam'd the Saxon, and the other *Scot*; he says only in one place, *Joannem ex antiqua Saxonia oriundum*: and in another, *Joannes Scotus*. Neither must one necessarily conclude from his discourse that he regarded them as two different men, as will appear if we take notice of what he wrote, and of the occasion which has oblig'd him the first time to make mention of this *John*, as it were transiently, reserving himself to speak of him more amply afterwards, as he has done. But when we should suppose, that *William* would distinguish these two *Johns*, this makes nothing to th' establishing what he relates of the Martyrdom of *John Scot*'s being a fable of his own invention: on the contrary, this very thing would help to establish, that knowing two *Johns*, and distinguishing them, he must have better known what ought to be said of both one and the other. Neither can it be said that he made two *Johns* Tutors of *Alfred*; for when he speaks of *John* who was Abbot of *Ætheling*, he does not say that he was the Tutor of *Alfred*, he says this only under the name of *John Scot*.

AS to what the Author of the *Dissertation* has remark'd, that *Anastasius* in his Letter written to *Charles the Bald* in 875. seems to speak of *John Scot* as of a man already dead; which shews that he was not the Tutor of *Alfred*, seeing that this Prince gave not himself to learning till in the year 884. Neither is it moreover likely that so Religious a Prince would make use of such a man as *John Scot*, who was decried as an Heretick driven out of th' University of *Paris* at the earnest pursuit of *Nicolas I.* as holding Doctrins contrary to the principal Fundamentals of Christian Religion.

I answer first, That our Author returns continually to his fabulous History, as if *John Scot* could have been driven out in the 9th. Century from the University of *Paris* which began only in the 12th. Secondly, It is certain that *Anastasius* speaks of *Erigenus* as of an holy and famous man, *Virum*, says he, *per omnia sanctum*; which does not shew that he was thought then unworthy of being the Kings Tutor, nor that he was decried at *Rome* for an Heretick. Thirdly, Seeing that *John Scot* was very much esteem'd by *Charles the Bald*, he might be so too by *Alfred* Son of *Ætelwolph*, Son in law to *Charles the Bald*. And in effect, *William* of *Malmsbury* testifies that he had seen the Letters of *Alfred*, wherein this Prince treated *John Scot* with great esteem and affection, *Alfredi munificentia & ministerio usus, ut ex scriptis Regis intellexi, sublimis Melduni resedit*, and this is a mere mockery to make these Letters pass for fictitious ones fram'd by the friends of *John Scot* and *Berenger*. Fourthly, It is not true that *Anastasius* speaks positively of *John Scot*, as of a man already deceased, and supposing it were, he might think so by reason of his great age, or some false report of his death. In fine, our Author absurdly supposes that *Alfred* did not betake himself to learning till the year 884. he has fallen into this mistake for want of considering that altho *Asser* and some of those that have follow'd him have attributed to this year what they have said of the Piety of *Alfred*, and his applying himself to learning, yet this happens merely from their recapitulating what hapned since the year 868, till 884. as I have already observ'd.

NEITHER is there more strength in the Argument which our Author draws from some terms which *William* of *Malmsbury* makes use of in relating the History of the Martyrdom of *John Scot*. *Hoc tempore creditur fuisse Joannes Scotus (propter hanc infamiam (credo) tæduit eum Franciæ) à pueris quos docebat ut fertur perforatus, martyr æstimatus est*. He pretends that these terms are doubtful, fears and suspicions, and that these ways of speaking are likely to make one doubt of the truth of this relation.

BUT all this deserves no answer. First, The Author of the *Dissertation* has mixt *Simeon* of *Durham*'s Text which bears *Propter hanc infamiam, &c.* with that of *William* of *Malmsbury*, who relates this fact as a thing evidently certain. And in effect the first term *creditur* refers to the time wherein *John Scot* lived in *England*. The second *credo* is added by the Author of the *Dissertation*, being not the Text of *Simeon* of *Durham*, who says only, *Propter hanc infamiam tæduit eum Franciæ*, and supposing it were in the Text of *Simeon*, 'twould only denote that it was his conjecture that *John Scot* left *France* for the displeasure he had to find himself accused of Heresie; neither do I know whether *tæduit* thus uttered, be not an expression too weak for a man whom the trouble of seeing himself accused of a crime so capital as is that of Heresie must make to have passed from one Realm to another. The third term *ut fertur* denotes only 'twas said that *John Scot* was stabb'd to death with Pen-knives. But the fourth, *Martyr æstimatus est*, does not denote any thing doubtful, and plainly signifies that he was held for a Martyr, which appears from what *William* of *Malmsbury* adds, *Quod sub ambiguo ad injuriam sanctæ animæ non dixerim cum celebrem ejus memoriam sepulchrum in sinistro latere altaris & Epitaphii prodant versus*: To build hereon conjectures of the falsity of this History, is very idle.



IN fine, the Argument which the Author of the *Dissertation* draws from the silence of *Berenger* and his Disciples who never mention'd the History of the Martyrdom of *John Scot*, is of no weight. First, We do not know what *Berenger* and his Disciples have said, the greatest part of their Writings never coming to our notice. Secondly, There's no inconveniency to suppose that the memory of the Martyrdom of *John Scot* (happning in a little place, as is *Malmsbury*, more than 150 years before the Disputes of *Berenger*) became not so publick in *France* that *Berenger* and his Disciples must needs know it. We know there are scarcely any remains of the famous Monastery of *S. Angilbert*, nor is he in the Catalogue of the Saints, *Frustra tamen Angilbertum quæras, ut & innumeros tutelares nostros sanctos* Syntagm. de Nith. *inter moderna sanctorum syntagmata*, said the deceased *M. Petean*, Counsellor in the Parliament of *Paris*. A man may say the same thing of *Ingelramnus*, or *Angilramnus*, who wrote the Book of Images under the name of *Charlemain*, and who pass'd for a Saint. For his name was in fine forgotten. But thirdly, Supposing *Berenger* and his Disciples had a particular notice of the Martyrdom and Holiness of *John Scot*, all that can be concluded from their silence is, that oftentimes every thing is not said on a subject which may be said. How many times have our Authors alledged the Books of Images under the name of *Charlemain*, without publishing the quality of Saint which has been given to this Prince? Has *Paschasius* the adversary of *John Scot* been mention'd as a Saint by *Lanfranc*, and his other partners in their Disputes against *Berenger*? Yet is it certain he was made to pass for one at *Corbie*, and this circumstance has been observed by *Alanus* and *Sirmond*. But, says the Author of the *Dissertation*, *Ascelin* would not De Euc. 2. 1. *have treated John Scot as an Heretick, he would have put a difference be-* c. 21. *tween his Book and his Person, had he believ'd he pass'd for a Martyr and* In vita Pasch. *Saint in the Church.* I answer, that this remark concludes nothing, unless that *Ascelin* suffered himself to be transported by his passion and prejudice; but *Ascelin's* transports do not at all invalidate the credibility of the Martyrdom and Holiness of *John Scot*. And as to our Author's remarking that neither does *Ingulphus* speak of this Martyrdom; we need only tell him that all Historians do not say every thing. *Ingulphus* says but one word of *John Scot* in treating of another subject. He denotes none of the circumstances of his life, he relates only that he was called into *England* by *Alfred*, and settled at *Etheling*. Yet is it true that he gives him the Title of a most holy Monk.

IT is then certain that the silence of these Writers can neither diminish the truth of the relation which *William* of *Malmsbury* makes touching the Martyrdom of *John Scot*, nor the esteem of his Holiness in that Church where-in he lived. Arde. 7.

IT is certainly no less vain and irrational for the Author of the *Dissertation* to set himself as he has done on criticising on a passage of *Thomas Fuller*, and a testimony of *Hector Boetius Deidonan*. For supposing that *Thomas Fuller* and several with him, were mistaken in saying that the martyrology which makes mention of *John Scot* in the 4th. of the Ides of *November* was Printed at *Anvers* in the year 1586. whereas it was Printed in 1583. by the command of *Gregory XIII.* supposing 'twere true that this Martyrology was not the Roman, which neither *Fuller*, nor *Mr. Claude* have affirm'd, supposing it were moreover true that *Baronius* has not taken away

away the name of *John Scot* from the Roman Martyrology: and tho the words of *Henry Firstsimon* cited by *Fuller* and *Varanus* were not well understood yet is it certain, First, That *Molanus* Professor in Divinity at *Lowvain*, has put *John Scot* in his Appendix to the Martyrology of *Usuard* publish'd at *Anvers* in 1583. Secondly, That Mr. *De Saussay* Bishop of *Toul* has likewise set him down in the Martyrology of the Gallican Church, and that both of 'em thought themselves oblig'd to follow *Deidonan*, who says that *John Scot* was set down in the Catalogue of Saints by the sacred Authority of the Popes. Thirdly, It may be that *Arnaud Wion* saying that the name of *John Scot* is to be seen in the Roman Martyrology, has taken that of *Usuard* for the Roman one. And in effect the learned are agreed, that the Martyrology of *Usuard* was adopted by the Roman Church, and that there has not been any such Martyrology as we have since *Galesinus* and *Baronius*. Fourthly, Supposing *Arnaud Wion* was mistaken in his conjecture, yet is it still certain that he has placed *John Scot* in the rank of the Saints of the Order of *S. Benet*, wherein he has been followed by the learned *Hugo Menard*, in the Text of the Martyrology of the Order of *S. Benet*, given the publick; which he confirms in the first Book of his Observations on this Martyrology. Fifthly, *Alford* the Jesuit has follow'd *Hugh Menard*, and has not sought all these subterfuges of the Author of the *Dissertation*; for he has rank'd *John Scot* in the Catalogue of Saints, in his Annals of *England*, Printed at *Liege* in 1663. wherein having mention'd him as a Martyr, he acquiesces in the judgment which the Bishop of *Toul* made of him, who placed him in the rank of Saints in the Appendixes of his Martyrology.

Vide Vales.  
append ad  
Euseb. Hist.

Ad 4. id. Nov.

A. 884. n. 4.  
& indic. Chron.

THE

# A T A B L E O F A U T H O R S Alledged in this Book.

Note, That the first Figure denotes the Part, the second the Book, and the third the Chapter.

A.

**D.** Luc d' Achery, *Not. ad vitam Lan-*  
*franc,* 2. 6. 9. 10.  
 Albertin *de Sacram. Euch. lib. 1. c. 30.* 2.  
 5. 11.  
     *lib. 2. p. 322.* 1. 4. 9.  
 Alcuinus *in Joan. lib. 2.* 2. 5. 8.  
     *in Joan. 6, 2.* 5. 9.  
     *in Joan. lib. 3.* Ibid.  
     *in Joan. lib. 6.* Ibid.  
     *De Divin. offic. cap. 40.* 2. 6. 10.  
 Alger *de Sacr. Euchar. lib. 2. c. 7.* 2. 6. 9.  
 Allatius *de Eccles. Occident. & Orient. perpet.*  
*consens. lib. 1. cap. 2.* 1. 3. 12.  
     *lib. 2. cap. 2.* 1. 2. 3.  
     *cap. 8.* ibid.  
     *cap. 9.* ibid.  
     *cap. 10.* ibid.  
     *cap. 11.* ibid.  
     *cap. 13.* 1. 2. 1.  
     *cap. 14.* 1. 2. 3.  
     *cap. 15.* ibid. &  
         1. 4. 6.  
     *cap. 17.* 1. 3. 3.  
     *lib. 3. cap. 6.* 1. 2. 5.  
     *cap. 7.* 1. 2. 5.  
     *cap. 2.* 1. 3. 1.  
     & 1. 3. 4. &  
         1. 3. 12. &  
         12. of  
     Book 3.

*Epist. 2. ad Nitius* 1. 3. 5.  
     *in adden. ad lib. de perp. conf.* 1. 4. 11.  
     *de lib. Eccl. Græc. dissert. 2.* 1. 3. 12.  
         1. 4. 5.  
     *In Orthod. Græc. apud Hotting.* ibid.  
     *De Simeon.* 1. 3. 6.  
     *Advers. Chreygth.* 1. 3. 9. & alias.  
     *Epist. de quor. Græc. opin.* 1. 2. 1.  
 Alphonfus à Castro *adv. hæc. lib. 6. hæc. 9.*  
     1. 3. 5.  
 Amalarius *Præf. ad lib. de Off. Ec.* 2. 3. 13.  
     *lib. 3. de Offic. cap. 25.* ibid.  
     *cap. 26.* ibid.  
 Ambrosius *de iis qui myst. init.* 1. 4. 5.  
     2. 6. 2.  
     *iterum in eodem libro & capite.*  
     *lib. 1. de Offic. cap. 48.* 2. 6. 11.  
     *De Sacram. lib. 4. cap. 3.* 2. 6. 2.  
 Anastasius Sinaita *in Odego.*  
 Christophorus Angelus *de stat. & rit. Eccl.*  
     *Græc.* 1. 5. 7.  
 Arcud. *de concord. Eccl. Occid. & Orient.*  
     *Epist. ded. Tom. 1. p. 231. 241.* 2. 5. 1.  
     *lib. 2. cap. 2.* 1. 3. 12.  
     *lib. 3. cap. 2.* 1. 3. 1.  
     *cap. 6.* 1. 3. 6.  
     *cap. 9.* 1. 3. 4.  
     *cap. 10.* 1. 3. 5.  
     *cap. 11.* ibid.  
     1. 3. 5. & infra.  
     *cap. 20.* 1. 3. 4.  
     cap.



# A TABLE of Authors.

cap. 21.	1.	3.	4.	ad ann. 1130.	ibid.
	&	3.	7.	ad ann. 1177.	1. 2. 4.
cap. 33.	1.	3.	5.	ad ann. 1179.	1. 4. 6.
cap. 55.		ibid.		Basilus in Psalm 14.	2. 5. 8.
cap. 60.	1.	3.	8.	Beda in Psalm 3.	2. 5. 7.
Archieraticon Græc. Habert.	1.	3.	5.		2. 5. 9.
	&	1.	3.	7.	ibid.
Arnaud of frequent Communion, Part 3.	illi.			in Psalm 21.	ibid.
	1.	3.	6.	in Psalm 33.	ibid.
Athanas. disput. in Concil. Nic.	1.	3.	4.	in Genes. cap. 1. p. 2. in eodem cap. & lib.	ibid.
in illud si quis dixerit, &c.	2.	5.	8.	in Exod. cap. 12. p. 2.	ibid.
Athanas. Presb. Bifant. ant. port.	1.	3.	12.	in Sam. cap. 5. p. 2.	ibid.
August. Epist. 106.	1.	1.	7.	in Sam. l. 1. cap. 12.	ibid.
in Psal. 3.	2.	5.	7.	in lib. 2. Reg. c. 3.	2. 5. 8.
in Psal. 87.	1.	3.	9.		& 5. 9.
	2.	5.	8.	in Tob.	2. 5. 8.
in Psal. 98.		ibid.		in Esdr. lib. 2. c. 8.	2. 5. 9.
de peccator. merit. & remiss. lib. 1.				in Job lib. 2. c. 14.	2. 5. 8.
c. 24.	2.	6.	7.	in Prov. lib. 3. c. 31.	2. 5. 9.
contra Adimant. c. 12.	2.	5.	8.	de Tabern. l. 2. cap. 2.	ibid.
de verb. Dom. Serm. 49.	1.	3.	9.	cap. 3.	2. 5. 8.
de verb. Dom. Serm. 53.		ibid.		in Cant. Canticor. c. 3.	2. 5. 8.
de verb. Apost. Serm.	2.	5.	8.	in Matth. 28.	2. 5. 8.
Serm. ad Infant.	2.	5.	7.	in Marc. cap. 13.	ibid.
	&	2.	6.	cap. 14.	ibid.
				in Luc. 22.	2. 5. 8.
				in Luc. 1. cap. 2.	ibid.
de utilit. credend. c. 1.	2.	6.	2.	in Joan 6.	ibid.
lib. 3. de Trinit. cap. 4.	2.	6.	2.	in cap. 6. ad Rom.	ibid.
Serm. de quarta feria,	2.	6.	2.	in 1 Cor. 11.	ibid.
& iterum in eod. cap. & libro.				hom. æstiv. de tem. fer. Sext. 2.	5. 8.
Serm. 12. ex 40. Sirm.	1.	3.	13.	iterum ibidem.	
contra Faust. l. 13. c. 16.	2.	5.	8.	hom. æstiv. de temp. Dom. 13. 2.	5. 7.
lib. 20. c. 21.	2.	5.	8.	Dom. 17.	ibid.
d'Avity, Tom. 1. of ancient and modern Heresies	2.	5.	4.	Dom. 24.	ibid.
				hom. æstiv. in vig. S. Joan. Bapt.	2. 5. 8.
				hom. de Sanctis in Epiph.	ibid.
				in Epist. ad Heb. cap. 7.	ibid.
				Bellarminus l. 1. de Euch. c. 1.	1. 3. 9.
					& 2. 5. 10.
				lib. 1. cap. 5.	2. 5. 11.
				lib. 3. cap. 13.	1. 3. 13.
					& 1. 4. 5.
				de Christianima, l. 4. c. 16.	ibid.
				de Purgator. l. 2. c. 18.	ibid.
				Bertramus de Cor. & San. Dom.	2. 6. 11.
				Beson. observ. Book 1. ch. 3.	1. 2. 1.
				ch. 39.	ibid.
				ch. 40.	ibid.
				Bessario de Sac. Euch.	1. 3. 3.
					& 1. 4. 10.
				Joseph Besson Holy Syria	1. 2. 1.
				Bibl. Patr. Græc. Lat. tom. 2.	1. 3. 5.
				Binnius not. in Epist. Innoc. 1.	2. 6. 7.
					Blondel's

**B** Alfamon in Canon. Apost. Can. 70. 1. 3. 6.  
 Barlaam Ep. 1. Bibl. Patr. tom. 2. edit. 4.  
 1. 4. 4.  
 Baronijs ad ann. 847. 2. 6. 11.  
 ad ann. 912. 2. 6. 6.  
 ad ann. 925. ibid.  
 ad ann. 938. ibid.  
 ad ann. 1035. 1. 4. 1.  
 ad ann. 1053. 1. 2. 3.  
 ad ann. 1095. ibid.  
 ad ann. 1097. 1. 2. 2.  
 ad ann. 1100. 1. 2. 3.  
 ad ann. 1112. ibid.  
 ad ann. 1118. ibid.  
 ad ann. 1119. ibid.

# A TABLE of Authors.

Blondel's *illucidations on the Eucharist*,  
*ch. 18.* 2. 6. 12.  
 Boucher's *Sacred Nofegay*, *Book 4. ch. 3.*  
 1. 3. 4.  
*chap. 6, 7.*  
 Boulay le Goux in *his Voyages* 1. 2. 4.  
 Breerwood's *Enquiries* 2. 5. 2.  
*& in cap. 4. ejusdem libri.*  
 Busbequius *Embassie* 1. 2. 5.  
 Bzovius *ad ann. 1318.* 2. 5. 4.

## C.

**C**Abasilas *Exp. Lit. cap. 30.* 1. 4. 8.  
*cap. 32.* *ibid.*  
*cap. 37.* 1. 3. 7.  
*cap. 38.* 1. 3. 4.  
*cap. 42.* 1. 3. 6.  
*cap. 43.* *ibid.*  
 Casaubon. *Exercit. in Baron. Exercit. 16.*  
*Art. 58.* 1. 1. 5.  
 Catharin. *tractat. de verb. quibus conf.*  
 2. 5. 10.  
 Cassander in *Liturg.* 2. 5. 8.  
 Cajetan in *3. Thom. quæst. 75. Art. 1.*  
 2. 5. 10.  
 Carol. Mag. *Ep. ad Alcuin. de Septuagesf.*  
 2. 5. 9.  
 Caryophil. *refut. Catech. Gerg.* 1. 3. 11.  
 Caucus de *Græc. recent. Hæc.* 1. 2. 1.  
*& 1. 3. 5. & alias.*  
 Cellotius in *append. ad histor. Gothescalc.*  
 2. 6. 9.  
 Chifflet. *Præf. in Conf. Alcuin.* 1. 3. 6.  
 Claud Taurin. *Comment. in Gal. cap. 1.*  
 2. 5. 8.  
 Clemens Alex. *Stromat. l. 3.* *ibid.*  
 Coccius *Thef. Cathol.* 2. 4.  
 Codinus de *Offic. Constantinopl. cap. 1.*  
 1. 2. 3.  
 Combefix *anctar. tom. 2. Not. ad. Isaac Arm.*  
*Cath. inn.* 1. 3. 8.  
 Comment. *trium patrum in Cant. Cant.*  
 1. 3. 6.  
 Comonitor. *Apol. Gabr. Sionit.* 2. 5. 2.  
 Chrysoft. in *Rom. hom. 9.* 1. 3. 13.  
*hom. 15.* 1. 3. 9.  
*hom. 23.* 1. 3. 12.  
*in Joan. hom. 44.* 1. 3. 13.  
*homil. in Eliam & viduam.*  
 2. 5. 8.  
*De Sacerd. l. 4.* 1. 3. 13.  
*& 2. 5. 8.*

Chrysoft. *Epist. ad Cæsar.* 1. 4. 1.  
 Concil. Constantin. in *actis Concil. Nicæn. 2.*  
 1. 3. 13.  
 Concil. Florent. *Sess. 23.* 1. 4. 6.  
*Sess. 25.* 1. 3. 3.  
*instructione ad Armen.*  
 2. 5. 2.  
 Concil. Lateran. *sub Innocent. 3. cap. 1.*  
 1. 3. 2.  
 Concil. Tridentin. *Sess. 3. c. 4.* *ibid.*  
 Concil. Trosleian in *præfat. 2. 6. 6.*  
*cap. 3.* *ibid.*  
*in Epilog.* *ibid.*  
 Cyril Alex. *contr. Nest. l. 4. c. 6.* 2. 5. 6.  
*in Joan. 6. 57.* 1. 3. 13.  
*apud Victor. Ant. Mss.* 1.  
 1. 4. 7.  
 Cyril Hierosol. *Catech. Myst. 1.* 2. 5. 8.  
*Catech. myst. 3.* *ibid.*  
*Catech. myst. 4.* 2. 5. 6.  
 Cyril Patr. *Const. Confesf. Fid.* 1. 3. 12.  
*Epist. 1. ad Witemb.* 1. 4. 5.  
*Epist. 2. ad Witemb.* 2. 5. 2.  
*& alias in eodem capite.*  
 Joan. Cottovic *itiner. Hierosf. & Syr.*  
 1. 2. 1.

## D.

**D**Aillé *right use of the Fathers,*  
 1. 1. 5.  
*& alias in eodem capite.*  
 Damascen *lib. Orthod. fid. c. 12.* 2. 5. 8.  
*cap. 14.* 1. 3. 13.  
*Orat. 1. de imag.* 1. 3. 7.  
*Epist. ad Zachar.* 1. 3. 13.  
*Homil. de Corp. & Sang. Dom.*  
*ibid.*  
 Durand de *Corp. & Sang. Dom. Part 1.*  
 2. 6. 11.  
*à Sancto Portiano in 4 Sent. Part 1.* *ibid.*

## E.

**E**Lias Cretens in *Orat. Apol. Greg. Naz.*  
 2. 6. 11.  
 Epiphian. in *Anaceph.* 1. *ibid.*  
*& 2. 5. 6.*  
 Ephrem de *Antioch apud Phol. Bibl.*  
 1. 3. 13.  
 Eusebius de *Theolog. Ecclesf. l. 3. cap. 12.*  
 2. 5. 8.

S s s s

Euthy.

# A TABLE of Authors.

Euthymius Panopl. tit. 20. 2. 5. 2.  
*& ibid. iterum.*  
*Commentar. in Matth. cap. 64.*  
 1. 3. 13.  
 Ether. *& Beat. l. 1.* 2. 5. 8.

## F.

Faber. *Joan. Rel. Moscov.* 2. 5. 6.  
 Facund. *l. 9.* 2. 5. 8.  
 Fancheur *on the Lords Supper, Book 3. ch. 6.*  
 2. 5. 6.  
 Felavius *Præfat. in Christ. Ang.* 1. 4. 4.  
*Annot. in Christ. Ang.* 1. 2. 1.  
 Florus *Magister exposit. Miss.* 2. 6. 9.

## G.

Gelasius *Papa apud Gratian. Can. Com-*  
*perimus* 2. 6. 7.  
*Adv. Eutychet. & Nest.* 2. 5. 2.  
 Gennadius *pro Concil. Flor.* 1. 3. 8.  
*& alias in eodem cap.*  
 Germanus *Theor. rer. Eccles.* 1. 3. 4.  
 Garcias d' Syl. *Embassie* 2. 5. 4.  
 Goar *Euchol.* 1. 2. 1.  
*Relat. of Antony de Gourveau* *ibid.*  
 Guaguin *descript. Mosc.* 1. 3. 3.  
 Guido *Carmel. de Heres.* *ibid.*  
 Guillielm. *Malmf.* 2. 6. 6.  
 Guillielm. *Tyr. de bello Sacro* 1. 2. 1.  
 Guillielm. *de Rubruqui's Voyages* *ibid.*  
 Gregor. *Mag. Dial. l. 4.* 2. 5. 9.  
 Gregor. *Naz. Orat. 4.* 1. 3. 3.  
 Gregor. *Nyssen Orat. 1. de pauper. amand.*  
 2. 5. 8.  
*Orat. 2. in illud faciamus hominem*  
*ibid.*  
*Orat in Baptism. Chr.* 1. 3. 13.  
*Orat. Catecht.* *ibid.*  
*Hôm. 7. in Cant. Cant.* 2. 5. 8.  
 Guitmundus *de ver. Euch. l. 2.* 2. 6. 11.

## H.

Harmenopolus *de Scdis* 2. 5. 2.  
 Hay's *Voyages* 1. 2. 1.  
 Herbert's *Voyages* *ibid.*  
*&* 2. 5. 2.  
 Heydanus *præfat. ad lib. cui titulus est can-*  
*sa Dei* 1. 3. 12.  
 Hesychius *in Levit.* 2. 5. 8.

Hieronymus *Comment. in Gal.* 2. 5. 8.  
*& in cap. 9.*  
*Comment. in Ep. ad Tit.* 1. 1. 7.  
*Comment. in Psal. 147.* 2. 5. 8.  
*& chap. 9.*  
 Histor. *Gottesc. Cellot in append.* 2. 6. 9.  
 History *marvellous of the Great Cam.*  
 1. 2. 4.  
*&* 2. 5. 2.  
 Histor. *Eccles. Hottinger.* 1. 3. 4.  
 Honor. *Augustod. de Script. Eccl.* 2. 5. 8.  
 Hottinger *in Append. Dissert. 8.* 1. 3. 12.  
 Hornbech. *Sum. Controv.* 1. 3. 7.  
 Humbert *contra Nicet.* 1. 3. 8.  
*Contra Græcor. calumen.* *ibid.*  
*& in seq.*

## I.

Iacobus *à vitriaco* 1. 2. 1.  
*&* 1. 2. 2.  
*& seq.*  
 Jarric *Hist. of the East-Indies* 1. 2. 1.  
*& iterum in eodem cap. & lib.*  
 Jeremias *Patriarch. Const. Resp. ad Vitemb.*  
 1. 3. 13.  
*&* 1. 4. 8.  
*& seq.*  
 Innocent X. *Pap. Constit. against 5 Proposit.*  
 1. 4. 5.  
 Joannis II *Epist. Episc. Rom.* 2. 5. 2.  
 Irineus *advers. Heres.* 1. 3. 3.  
*&* 1. 3. 13.  
 Isidor *Pelus Epist. l. 1. Ep. 136.* 1. 3. 4.  
*Epist. 303.* 2. 5. 8.  
 Jovius *Paulus de Legat. Mosc.* 2. 5. 1.  
*& in seq.*  
 Isidor *Hispal. Orig. l. 6. c. 19.* 2. 5. 8.  
*lib. 7. cap.* 2. 5. 9.  
*Comment. in Gen. c. 1.* 1. *ibid.*  
*cap. 23.* *ibid.*  
*in Exod. cap. 23.* *ibid.*  
*in lib. 1. Reg. c. 20.* 2. 5. 2.  
*in lib. 2. Reg. c. 3.* 2. 5. 8.  
*allegor. veter. Testam.* 2. 5. 9.  
*de Offic. Eccles. l. 1. c. 15.* *ibid.*  
*lib. 1. cap. 18.* 1. 5. 8.  
 Sententiar. *l. 1. c. 14.* *ibid.*

## L.

Lanfranc *de Cor. & San. Do.* 1. 4. 4.  
*&* 2. 6. 8.  
 Lazi-



# A TABLE of Authors.

Lazicius de Relig. Armen. 2. 5. 2.  
 Leontius Bizantin advers. Nestor. & Eutyeb. 2. 5. 6.  
 Letter of an Ecclesiastic to one of his Friends, 2. 6. 5.  
 Letters of strange Countreys to the procurer of the Missions 1. 2. 1.  
 & ibid. & 2. 5. 2.  
 Loirs Voyages 1. 2. 1.  
 & 1. 2. 4.  
 & ibid.  
 Liber Cathol. Serm. apud Voloch. 2. 6. 11.  
 Lugdunensis Eccles. de tenend. verit. Script. 2. 6. 11.  
 Stephen de Lusignan History of Cyprus 1. 2. 2.

## M

**M** Aldonat in Joan. 6. 2. 6. 7.  
 Manuelis Patriar. Resp. 1. 3. 8.  
 Macarius, hom. 34. 1. 3. 3.  
 Hom. 44. ibid.  
 Matth. Paris in Henric. III. 1. 2. 3.  
 Mauguin Dissert. 2. 6. 8.  
 Menard Prefat. in lib. Sacram. Gregor. 2. 5. 7.  
 Method pacifick of Father Maimbourg, 2. 6. 1.  
 Metrophanes Critop. confess. Eccles. Orient. 1. 3. 3.  
 Resp. ad quest. 1. 3. 11.  
 Respons. Meletii Metropolit. Ephes. ad interr. ibid.  
 Missa five Can. univers. Æth. 2. 5. 6.  
 Missa Christianor. apud Indes. ibid.  
 Montconis Voyages 1. 2. 1.  
 Morinus his Exercit. 9. de Diacon. cap. 1. 2. 5. 8.

## N

**N** icephor. Hist. Eccles. lib. 18. cap. 48. 2. 5. 2.  
 cap. 52. 2. 5. 6.  
 cap. 53. 1. 2. 2.  
 Nicetas Pectorat. cont. Latin. 1. 3. 8.  
 & ibid.  
 Nicet. Choon annal. lib. 3.  
 Nicolas de Nicolai's Voyages 1. 3. 10.  
 Nicolaus Methon. advers. dub. 1. 3. 13.  
 Nicephor. Patr. Const. apud Allat. ibid.  
 Nikon. Epist. de pessima pessim. Armenor Rel. 1. 1. 1.

Nouet. Presence of Christ in the Sacram. 1. 6. 5.

## O

**O** Cham Quodl. 4. quest. 35. 1. 3. 9.  
 Oecumen. in 1 Pet. c. 2. 1. 3. 8.  
 in 1 Cor. 10. 1. 6. 2.  
 Office of the H. Sacram. 1. 6. 3.  
 Olearius Voyage of Moscov. 2. 5. 9.  
 Origen Comment. in Matth. 15. 2. 5. 6.  
 in Matth. hom. 35. 2. 5. 8.  
 in Matth. hom. 1. ibid.  
 in Matth. hom. 7. 2. 5. 8.  
 in Job. lib. 3. 1. 1. 7.  
 contr. Celsus, lib. 5. ibid.  
 Hom. 2. in divers. 1. 5. 3.

## P

**P** achymer. bist. lib. 2. c. 15. 1. 2. 3.  
 cap. 16. ibid.  
 lib. 3. cap. 1. ibid.  
 cap. 18. p. 1. 1. 2. 4.  
 cap. 13. ibid.  
 cap. 21. ibid.  
 cap. 23. ibid.  
 lib. 5. cap. 12. ibid.  
 lib. 4. cap. 6. 1. 2. 3.  
 cap. 17. ibid.  
 cap. 24. ibid.  
 & 1. 4. 5.  
 Pallad. Histor. Lausiac. 1. 4. 7.  
 & 2. 5. 8.  
 Pasch. Ratb. in Matth. cap. 26. 1. 4. 7.  
 & 2. 6. 8.  
 Præfat. in lib. de Corp. & Sang. ibid.  
 De Corp. & Sang. Dom. cap. 2. 2. 6. h.  
 & 2. 6. 9.  
 cap. 3. ibid.  
 Epist. ad Frudeg. 3. 6. 6.  
 & 2. 6. 8.  
 Pavillons triumph of the Euch. 2. 6. 5.  
 Perron of the Eucharist, Book 2. chap. 13. 2. 5. 2.  
 Petav. Ration. temper. Part 1. lib. 8. cap. 13. 1. 2. 3.  
 cap. 18. 1. 1. 4.  
 cap. 21. 1. 2. 3.  
 lib. 9. cap. 7. 1. 4. 5.

## S s s s 2

Petrus

# A TABLE of Authors.

Petrus de Alltaco in 4. senten. quest. 6. art. 4.	1. 4. 5.	1351.	ibid.
Photius de Synod.	1. 3. 7.	1366.	1. 2. 5.
Voyages of Petro della Valle	1. 2. 1.	1370.	1. 2. 3. ib.
Voyages of John Plan Carpin.	1. 2. 4.	1442.	2. 5. 6.
Polidor Virgil Hist. Angl. l. 6.	1. 6. 6.	1445.	1. 2. 4.
Port Royal and Genève agreed	2. 6. 12.		& 2. 5. 6.
Poslerin de reb. Moscov.	1. 2. 1.	1514.	1. 2. 4.
	& seq.	1515.	& 1. 3. 5.
Postel de Republ. Turks	1. 3. 10.	1519.	1. 2. 4.
Poulets Relation of the Levant, Part 2.			ibid.
chap. 20.	1. 2. 5.	Richard's Relation of the Isle of S. Erinis	1. 2. 1.
ch. 28.	1. 2. 1.	ch. 4. 5. & Book 3. ch. 5. 7. 8. 10.	
Bibliot. Select. l. 5.	1. 3. 10.	Relation of the Voyage of Mr. de Berite,	1. 2. 4.
	& alias.	Relation of the Embassies of the Earl of Car-	2. 5. 1.
Bibliot. Select. l. 6.	1. 2. 1.	lile	2. 5. 2.
Parateolus Elench. hæret.	1. 3. 5.	Relation of the Missions and Voyages of	1. 3. 1.
Professio Fid. à Græcis faciend. apud Posse-	1. 3. 10.	French Bishops	1. 3. 1.
rin.		Remarks on the request of M. the Arch-Bi-	1. 3. 1.
Professio Fid. à Saracenis faciend.	1. 3. 13.	shop of Minbrun	1. 3. 1.
&	1. 4. 8.	Remarks on the 18. Tome of the Annals of	1. 3. 12.
		Odoricus Raynaldus,	page 1. Pref.
		Rivels Letter to M. Sarraan	1. 3. 12.
		Roger of the H. Land	1. 2. 1.
			ibid. ch. 4.
		Ross his View of Religions	2. 5. 4.
		Rubruqui's Voyages	1. 2. 4.
		Responsum ad petitionem allat. Regi.	2. 6. 12.
		Remig. Altifiodor. Comment. in 1 Cor. 10.	2. 6. 10.
		in cap. 11.	ibid.
		in Exposit. Canon.	ibid.
		in cap. 10. ad Hebr.	ibid.
		Rupert in Joan. l. 6.	1. 4. 5.
		in Exod. l. 2. cap. 10.	ibid.
		in Mat. cap. 10.	2. 5. 8.
		de Divin. Offic. l. 2. c. 2.	2. 6. 10.
			S.
		Sacranus Relig. Ruthen.	1. 3. 3.
		Book 3. ch. 7, 8, 10. &	2. 5. 1.
		Scarga Errores Moscov.	1. 3. 3.
		& ch. 7. & ch. 10.	
		Saligniaci Itiner. Ter. Sanc.	2. 5. 2.
		Sedulius opera Pasch. l. 5. c. 13.	2. 5. 8.
		Seioliach Epist. ad Velfer.	2. 5. 6.
		Stephani jun. Vita	1. 3. 7.
		Simeon Thessalon. de Templ.	1. 3. 4.
		& ch. 6.	
			Sigif.
Aban de instit. Cler. c. 31.	2. 6. 11.		
Pænit. cap. 33.	2. 5. 8.		
	& alias.		
Raynaldus Annal. Eccles. ad ann. 1199.	1. 2. 4.		
ad ann. 1233.	ibid.		
1237.	ibid.		
1245.	1. 2. 4.		
1246.	ibid.		
1247.	1. 2. 4.		
1253.	ibid.		
1256.	1. 2. 3.		
1261.	ibid.		
1262.	1. 2. 4.		
1263.	ibid.		
1264.	ibid.		
1267.	1. 2. 4.		
1276.	ibid.		
1277.	ibid.		
1278.	ibid.		
1288.	ibid.		
1289.	2. 5. 6.		
1299.	1. 2. 4.		
1318.	1. 2. 4. 5.		
1338.	1. 2. 5.		
1341.	2. 5. 2.		
	ibid. & cap. 3.		
1346.	2. 5. 3.		
1350.	2. 5. 3.		

# A TABLE of Authors.

Sigismund. <i>Comm. rer. Mosc.</i>	1.	3.	7.	<i>in Joan.</i>	2.	5.	8.
& ch. 8, 9. &	2.	5.	1.	Theodor Grapbus	1.	3.	13.
Spondanus <i>Annal. Eccles. ad annum</i> 439.	2.	5.	2.	Theorianus <i>dial. adv. Arm.</i>	2.	5.	2.
<i>ad ann.</i> 1524.	1.	2.	2.	Thevenot's <i>Voyages</i>	1.	2.	1.
1531.	1.	2.	4.	& ch. 4.5. & Book 3. ch. 7.	2.	5.	6.
1561.	1.	2.	1.	Thomas Aquinas <i>sum. 3. part. quæst</i> 75.			
1584.	1.	2.	5.	<i>art. 2.</i>	2.	5.	1.
1600.	1.	1.	5.	Thom. à Jêsu de <i>procurand. salut. omnium</i>			
Stochovius <i>Voyages</i>	1.	2.	4. 5.	<i>gent.</i>	1.	3.	7.
Sylv. Cathemer.	1.	3.	13.	& 12. & Book 4. ch. 3. & ch. 5, 6.			
Sigebert de <i>Script. Eccl. c. 17.</i>	2.	6.	2.	<i>Part 2. Book 5. ch. 1, 2, 4, 6.</i>			
Spiceleg. <i>Tom. 6. de gestis Abbat</i> Lobb.				Thomas Valdens. <i>Tom. 2. c. 19.</i>	2.	6.	11.
	2.	6.	2.	<i>cap. 30.</i>	2.	5.	4.
Syropulus <i>Histor. Concil. Florent. Sect.</i> 2.				<i>cap. 52.</i>	2.	6.	11.
	1.	2.	3.	Tatianus <i>Diateffar.</i>	2.	6.	2.
<i>Sect. 3.</i>	1.	2.	1.	Turco <i>Grecia</i>	1.	4.	5.
	&	4.	6.	Tractatus <i>contr. Græcos</i>	1.	3.	8.
<i>Sect. 4.</i>	1.	3.	10.				
<i>Sect. 5.</i>	1.	3.	12.	V.			
<i>Sect. 10.</i>	1.	4.	6.	Vincent le Blanc <i>Voyages</i>	1.	2.	1.
T.				<i>Voyages of Villamont</i>	1.	2.	4.
Tertullian de <i>jejunio, c. 1.</i>	1.	1.	7.	& Book 4. ch. 5.			
<i>cap. 2.</i>	ibid.			Valafridus Strabo de <i>reb. Eccl.</i>	2.	5.	8.
De <i>Resurr. carn. c. 37.</i>	2.	5.	8.	Valerianus <i>Hom 7.</i>	ibid.		
De <i>Baptismo</i>	ibid.			Victor Antiochenus <i>Comment in Marc. Mss.</i>			
Theodorus Abucara <i>Dial. 22.</i>	1.	3.	13.		1.	3.	13.
Theodore <i>Dial. 1.</i>	1.	3.	13.	Vigilius <i>contr. Eutychet. l. 5.</i>	2.	5.	2.
<i>Dial. 2.</i>	2.	5.	2.				
Theodor. <i>Epitom.</i>	1.	3.	13.	Z.			
Theophil. <i>Alix. Epist. Pasch.</i>	ibid.			Zonar in <i>Canon Concil. in trullo, can. 32.</i>			
Theophilact in <i>Matth.</i>	1.	4.	7.		1.	3.	9.
<i>in Marc. 14.</i>	1.	3.	13.	Zonar <i>Epist. ad calcem, tom. 6. Cyril Alex.</i>			
<i>in Joan. 6.</i>	ibid.			<i>ibid.</i>			
& Book 4. c. 7. & p. 2. ch. 3.							

The end of the Table of Authors.

A TA-



# A T A B L E

## O F T H E

### Chief Matters contained in this B O O K.

Note, That the Figure immediately after the matter denotes the Part, the other  
at the end of the Line the Page.

A.

A Bridgements, their right use, 1.	31
Abyssinians ignorant, 1.	70
Abyssinians superstitious, 1.	71
Adoration, according to the Greeks and Latins, is either subaltern, or sovereign, or relative, or absolute, or inward, or outward, 1.	153
Adoration of the Eucharist, the question of it must be considered as a means to clear up that of Transubstantiation, and not as a consequence, 1.	156
Adoration of the Eucharist double; according to Mr. Arnaud, voluntary and ritual, 1.	180
The Greeks adore not the Sacrament with a sovereign and absolute Adoration, as the Latins do, 1.	153. & seq.
The Greeks do not practise any of those things which the Latins do to shew that they Adore the Sacrament with a sovereign adoration	164
The Greeks justify the relative Adoration of Images by the example of the Adoration of the Eucharist	166
The Greeks place the Adoration of the Eucharist in the same rank with that of the Cross, Temples, and sacred Vestments	166
Abraham Echellensis a decayed Author, unworthy of credit, 2.	14
Accidents, their existence without a subject, not taught by the Greeks, 1.	186
Alexis Comenius the Greek Emperor favours the Latin Religion, 1.	183
Ambassadors, of England and Holland justifi'd in the business of Cyril, against the unjust accusations of Mr. Arnaud, 1.	205
Armenians believe that Jesus Christ was man only in appearance, 2.	17
Armenians are real Eutychians, 2.	19
Armenians extreme ignorant, 1.	68
Armenians very superstitious, 2.	72
Armenians reject expressly Transubstantiation and the Real Presence, 2.	26
Armenians believe that the Sacrament is the Body of Jesus Christ in sign or resemblance, 2.	26
Armenians pretend to renounce their Opinions to cheat the Latins, 2.	34
Armenians, an account of their Opinions taken by Pope Benedict XII, 2.	29
What signified the Amen which the Communicants answered, 2.	141
	Mr. Ar-

## A T A B L E of the Matters.

Mr. Arnaud seems to prefer the reputation of the Treatise of the Perpetuity before the interests of the Roman Church, 1.	6
Mr. Arnaud censures what he does himself, 1.	7
Mr. Arnaud leaves the method of the Author of the Perpetuity and his pretension, 1.	26
Mr. Arnaud produces nothing that is formal on the Greeks part for Transubstantiation, 1.	118
Mr. Arnaud cites the testimony of Latinis'd Greeks, 1.	263
Mr. Arnaud quotes doubtful Authors, 1.	263
Mr. Arnaud produces the testimonies of false Greeks, Scholars of the Seminary at Rome, 1.	265
Mr. Arnaud is oblig'd to prove his Thesis touching the Greeks by positive Arguments, whereas we may prove ours by negative ones, 1.	277
Mr. Arnaud contradicts himself, 1.	315
Mr. Arnaud opposes himself, and treats himself as ridiculous, 1.	317
Mr. Arnaud overthrows the argument which those of the Church of Rome draw from these words, My Flesh is meat indeed, 2.	77
Mr. Arnaud does himself overthrow with one blow the greatest part of his Book, 2	ibid.
Mr. Arnaud's discourse favours the Sociniens, 2.	114
Mr. Arnaud's Defences weak against my complaints, 2.	260
Mr. Arnaud's personal complaints and accusations unjust, 2.	264
Mr. Arnaud and the Author of the Perpetuity's expressions disadvantageous to Christian Religion in general, 2.	268
Mr. Arnaud and his friends suspected to be of intelligence with us, 2.	ibid.
Mr. Arnaud's negative Arguments taken single, overthrow one another, 1.	293
Articles whereon the Greeks and Latins disagree, and yet do not dispute thereon, 1.	279
Mr. Aubertin's Book the first occasion of this dispute, 1.	10
Mr. Aubertin's Book, whereof it consists, 1.	12
Mr. Aubertin's Book has been indirectly assaulted, 1.	13

### B.

<b>B</b> Read of the Eucharist considered by the Greeks in two times, or on the Prothesis, or on the Altar, 1.	216
Bread is changed into the Body of Jesus Christ, according to the Greeks, 1.	216
Bread, in what manner chang'd, God only knows, say the Greeks, 1.	ibid.
Bread, change thereof into the Body of Jesus Christ may be understood in two manners, 1.	217
Bread and Wine are join'd to the Divinity according to the Greeks, 1.	220
Bread is made the Body of Jesus Christ by way of augmentation, according to the Greeks, 1.	227

### C.

<b>C</b> Asaubon, a man of an unsettled mind, and of no great judgment, 1.	29
Centuriators of Magdebourg are not witnesses to be alledged in this Controversie, 1.	38

## A T A B L E of the Matters.

Centuries, all of 'em must be traced in beginning from the Apostles in a search of Tradition, 2.	100
Century 10. mixt with two Doctrins, to wit, that of Paschasius, and that of Bertram, 2.	175
Century 10. very ignorant, 2.	178
Century 10. very confused, 2.	180
Change hapned touching the point of the Adoration of Images, 2.	192
Changes insensible hapned either amongst the Greeks, or amongst the Latins, 2.	195
Christians of the East very ignorant, 1.	67
Christians of S. John very ignorant, 1.	ibid.
Church is call'd the Body of Jesus Christ, the Real Body, &c. 2.	74
Commerce frequent between the Greeks and the Latins, since the 11th. Century, 1.	27
Council of Constantinople taught the Eucharist was a substance of Bread, 1.	347
Council of Nice II. unjustly arrogated the Title of Universal, 1.	356
Council of Nice II. in what sense denied the Bread was an Image, 1.	340
Council of Nice II. in what sense meant the Bread was properly the Body of Jesus Christ, 1.	339
Council of Constantinople, why it called the Eucharist an Image that was not deceitful, 1.	352
Council of Constantinople, in what sense it said our Saviour Christ chose in the Eucharist, a matter which had not any traits of humane likeness, lest Idolatry should be introduced, &c. 1.	353
Council of Rome under Nicolas II. did not formally establish Transubstantiation, 1.	245
Council of Florence held on politick respects by both sides, 1.	297
Council of Florence, in which the Greeks would no more dispute, 1.	300
Council of Florence, in which the Greeks assist against their wills, 1.	ibid.
Council of Florence, in which the re-union was made in general terms, 1.	127
Concomitance not taught by the Greeks, 1.	186
Conjunction of Bread with the Body of Jesus Christ, taught by some in the 9th. Century, 2.	233
Constantin Monomaq. Greek Emperor favours the Pope against Cerularius, 1.	180
Coptics extreme ignorant, 1.	68
Coptics superstitious, 1.	71
Coptics do not hold Transubstantiation, nor the Real Presence, 2.	54
Custom of Communicating under both kinds, that of giving the Communion to little Children, and that of Fasting till the Evening have been changed, 2.	190
Croisado's for the Holy Land in the 11th. and 12th. Centuries, 1.	74
Cyril Patriarch of Constantinople had the Latins and the false Greeks for his enemies, 1.	206
Cyril ever beloved by his Church, 1.	207
Cyril's Confession not contrary to the Faith of the Greek Church, 1.	208

### D.

**D**eceased, according to the Greeks receive the same as the Living in the Eucharist, 1.

151

Deci:



## A TABLE of the Matters.

Decisions of Councils prescribe not against truth	Preface.
Decisions of Councils are considerable when conformable to Scripture	ibid.
Deoduin Bishop of Liege imputes to Berenger, 1.	245
Differences and Agreement between the Latins and the Greeks on the point of the Eucharist, 1.	233
Differences and Agreements between the Greeks and us on the same point, 1.	236
Difference between the difficulties in the common mysteries of Christianity and those in Transubstantiation, 1.	188
Difficulties of Transubstantiation fall naturally in the mind, 1.	189
Difference between not believing the Real Presence, and believing the Real Absence, 2.	128
Difference between the example of an Angel appearing under the form of a Man, and the Body of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist under the form of Bread, 2.	148
Doctrin of the Latin Church in the eighth Century, 2.	89

### E.

<b>E</b> missaries of the Romish Seminary sent into Greece to receive Orders there from Schismatick Bishops, 1.	205
Emissaries make use of Schools to insinuate the Roman Religion, 1.	99
Emissaries o'respread the East since the 11th. Century, 1.	90
Emperors Greek have laboured to introduce the Latin Religion into Greece, 1.	81
Enthusiasms made in favour of Mr. Arnaud's Book, 1.	47. 61
Emissaries sent expressly to establish the honor of the Sacrament, 1.	79
Eucharist necessary to little Children, according to S. Austin, and the whole ancient Church, 1.	58
Eucharist breaks the Fast, according to the Greeks, 1.	253
Eucharist buried by the Greeks, or thrown into Wells, and thrown on the ground, 1.	172
Emissaries prevail by Money, 1.	98
Emissaries gain the Bishops, 1.	97
Eutychiens say our Saviour was man only in appearance, 2.	16
Et, is oft explicative and taken for that is to say, 1.	224
Ethiopians believe neither Transubstantiation, nor the Real Presence, 2.	54
Expressions general capable of several particular senses, 1.	119
Expressions of the Greeks on other Subjects, are like to those on the Eucharist, 1.	129
Eucharist according to the Greeks consists of Bread and Holy Spirit, 1.	218.

### F.

<b>F</b> athers, according to Father Nouet are a Forest,	Preface.
Fathers must not be the Rule of our Faith, 1.	10
Fathers against Transubstantiation, 1.	40
Fathers have wrote several things inconsistent with Transubstantiation, 1.	40
Fathers, in what manner they explain themselves when they design the nature of the Sacrament, 2.	92
Feast of God rejected by the Greeks, 1.	165
Formulary of the re-union between the Latins and the Greeks, different in Greek from the Latin, 1.	249

# A TABLE of the Matters.

G.

<b>G</b> Georgiens very ignorant, 1.	68
<b>G</b> reeks very ignorant, 1.	64
Greek Bishops leave their Flocks to the Emissaries for Money, 1.	98
Greeks superstitious, 1.	72
Greeks much degenerated in their manners, 1.	63
Greeks entreat the assistance of the Latins, 1.	74. & seq.
Greeks have always flattered the Popes with the hope of their re-union, 1.	81
Greeks of two sorts, the one united to the Roman Church, the others not united, 1.	109. & seq.
Greeks re-united out of this Dispute, 1.	110
Greek Schismatics of two sorts, the one more rigid, the others less, 1.	87
Greeks do not believe the Real Presence of the Latins, 1.	112. 234
Greeks reject the term of Transubstantiation, 1.	114
Greek Apostat censured for putting into his Catechism the word Transubstantiation, 1.	115
Greeks must use the term of <i>μελυσίωσις</i> , if they believe the substantial conversion, 1.	115. & seq.
Greeks in their re-union have changed the terms of the Latins, 1.	224. & seq.
Greeks of the Council of Florence held not Transubstantiation, 1.	127
Greeks Profelytes of the Latins express themselves differently when converted, 1.	128
Greeks only receive the seven first Councils, 1.	122
Greeks say our Saviour is present in the Book of the Gospel, 1.	131
Greeks speak of the Bread and Wine before the Consecration in the same manner as after, 1.	131
Greeks prostrate themselves to the Bread and Wine before they be consecrated, 1.	132
Greeks make several Particles	132
Greeks call the Particles of the Body of the Virgin, the Body of S. Nicolas, &c. 1.	131
Greeks joyn the small particles with the great ones, 1.	131
Greeks say that these Particles participate of our Lord's Body and Blood, 1.	136
Greeks only establish a spiritual Communion with Jesus Christ, 1.	148
Greeks disputing on the Azymis, suppose the Eucharist to be real Bread, 1.	169
Greeks neglect the substance of the Sacrament, 1.	172
Greeks teach not the necessary consequences of Transubstantiation, nor the Real Presence, 1.	185
Greeks do not believe there's made any impression of the physical form of the Body of Jesus Christ on the Bread, 1.	231
Greeks prostrate themselves before the Book of the Gospel, 1.	158
Greeks explain these words, This is my Body, in a sense of virtue, 1.	307
Greeks reject the Apocrypha, 1.	280
Greeks have nothing determinate amongst 'em touching the state of Souls after death, 1.	209
Greeks in their re-union at Florence and elsewhere with the Latins never pretended to receive their Doctrin, 1.	287
Greeks	

## A TABLE of the Matters.

<i>Greeks little solicitous about affairs of Religion, 1.</i>	287
<i>Greek Bishops love not disputes, 1.</i>	287
<i>Greeks contented with maintaining their Doctrins without condemning those of the Latins, 1.</i>	287

### I.

<b>J</b> acobits believe that Jesus Christ was man only in appearance, 2.	17
<i>Jacobits believe not Transubstantiation nor the Real Presence, 2.</i>	54
<i>Jacobits reject Auricular Confession, 1.</i>	282
<i>John le Fevre a fabulous Author, 2.</i>	9
<i>John the Parisian maintain'd in the 14th. Century that Transubstantiation was not an Article of Faith, 1.</i>	288
<i>Jesus Christ alone, not the Priest, gives in the Communion his Body and his Blood, 1.</i>	148
<i>Jesus Christ preached his Gospel to the damned, according to the Greeks, 1.</i>	280
<i>Infallibility of the Roman Church is a thing of which the ordinary sort of people cannot assure themselves, 1.</i>	29
<i>Infallibility of the Roman Church overthrown by the Author of the Perpetuity, 1.</i>	53
<i>Infallibility popular is a Principle to be proved, 1.</i>	54
<i>Infallibility double, 1.</i>	55
<i>Invocation of Saints rejected by the Greeks in one sense, 1.</i>	203
<i>Judgment of the Faculty of Paris on the affair of John the Parisian, 1.</i>	289

### K.

<b>K</b> nowledg distinct is taken in two senses, 2.	168
<i>Knowledg distinct, and popular knowledg are not the same, 2.</i>	170
<i>Knowledg distinct, and knowledg popular are not the same, 2.</i>	ibid.

### L.

<b>L</b> anguage double of Mr. Arnaud on the subject of the Eucharist, refuted, 1.	347. & seq.
<i>Latins establish Latin Bishops in Palestin, and drive out the Greek ones, 1.</i>	75
<i>Latins constrain the Greeks to embrace their Religion, 1.</i>	77
<i>Latins fill Greece with Inquisitors, 1.</i>	78
<i>Latins have done all they could to introduce Transubstantiation amongst the Eastern people, 1.</i>	106
<i>Latins in the re-union at the Florentin Council leave their usual expressions</i>	127
<i>Latins greatly perplexed touching the nourishment which our bodies receive in the Eucharist, 1.</i>	187
<i>Latins cause their Greek Profelytes to profess the Doctrin of Transubstantiation, 1.</i>	ibid.
<i>Latins have never disputed with the Greeks about their general expressions, 1.</i>	290
<i>Latins dreaded by the Greeks, 1.</i>	285
<i>Legats Excommunicate the Patriarch of Constantinople, 1.</i>	82
<i>Liturgies, Greek, denote the Bread to be made the Body of Jesus Christ in sanctification, 1.</i>	140
<i>Liturgies, Greek, commonly term the Eucharist Bread, 1.</i>	141



# A TABLE of the Matters.

<i>Liturgies, Greek, direct Prayers to our Saviour in Heaven after the Consecration of the Bread, 1.</i>	142
<i>Liturgies contain not one clause which denotes the substantial Presence, 1.</i>	142

## M.

<b>M</b> aronits believe neither Transubstantiation nor the Real Presence before their union to the Church of Rome, 2.	52
Maronits very ignorant, 1.	69
Manuel Comnenus Greek Emperor favours the Latins, 1.	83
Matter subsists in the Eucharist after Consecration, 2.	90
Method, lawful, whereby to examin the Controversie of the Eucharist,	Pref.
Methods of Father Maimbourg and Nouet compared	ibid.
Method of Mr. Arnaud yields new advantages	ibid.
Method of the Perpetuity, four considerations thereon, 1.	5
Method of Controversie ought to be grounded on Principles either granted by both sides, or well proved ones, 1.	9
Method of prescription of the Author of the Perpetuity fruitless, 1.	26
Method of the Perpetuity, reduces us after many disputes, to begin again, 1.	52
Michael Paripaniacus Greek Emperor favours the Roman Church, 1.	82
Paleologus earnestly labours for a re-union, 1.	84
Moscovits very ignorant, 1.	69
Moscovits have no Preachers, 2.	2
Moscovits very superstitious, 2.	ibid.
Moscovits differ in many things from the Greeks, 2.	3

## N.

<b>N</b> estorians very ignorant, 1.	69
Nestorians believe not Transubstantiation, &c. 2.	50
Nestorians use not Auricular Confession, nor confirmation, 1.	282
Niceas Pectoratus forced to burn his Book which he wrote against the Latins, 1.	82

## O.

<b>O</b> riental parts o'respread with Monks and Emissaries since the 11th. Century, 1.	90
Oderborn a Lutheran was deceived touching the Adoration which the Greeks give the Sacrament, 1.	163
Oriental people say that our Saviour dipt the Bread which he gave to Judas to take off its Consecration, 2.	52
Oriental people hold that the substance of the Eucharist disperses it self immediately over all the parts of our body, 2.	52
Oriental people say we must read, This is the Sacrament of my Body, 2.	53

## P.

<b>P</b> aïsius Ligaridiüs, what kind of man, 1.	266
Patriarch, Greek, of Jerusalem Excommunicates every year the Latin Church, 1.	206
Poore are Jesus Christ himself, 2.	74. & seq.
Point fixt of the Author of the Perpetuity, impossible, &c. 1.	45
	Policy

## A TABLE of the Matters.

<i>Policy hindered the Greeks and the Latins in the Council of Florence, to treat of Transubstantiation and the Real Presence, and the Substantial Presence, 1.</i>	197
<i>Paschasius proposes his Doctrin as the Doctrin of the Church, which was not well understood, 2.</i>	172
<i>Paschasius acts by way of opposition and contradiction in respect of his Adversaries, 2.</i>	172
<i>Paschasius taught the Substantial Conversion and Real Presence, 2.</i>	198
<i>Paschasius never vaunted that his Doctrin was that of the Church of his time, 2.</i>	225
<i>Paschasius endeavours to justifie himself from the charge of Enthusiasm and rashness, 2.</i>	210
<i>Paschasius was an Innovator, 2.</i>	214
<i>Paschasius acknowledges that before him men were ignorant of his Doctrin, 2.</i>	214
<i>Paschasius accused of being a Visionary, Enthusiast, &amp;c. 2.</i>	219
<i>Paschasius his Adversaries affirm that the Bread is the Body of Jesus Christ in virtue, 1.</i>	314
<i>Paschasius offers his Opinion as a Paradox, 2.</i>	224
<i>Paschasius and Bertram contrary, 2.</i>	255
<i>Paschasius submits his Doctrin to the judgment of Frudegard, 2.</i>	225
<i>Paschasius Author of the Doctrin of the Real Presence according to Bellarmin and Sirmond, 2.</i>	226
<i>Paschasius defamed by his Adversaries by reason of his Doctrin, 2.</i>	228
<i>Preface to the Answer of Father Nouet, justifi'd, 2.</i>	269
<i>Proofs negative, oppos'd against those of Mr. Arnaud, 1.</i>	272
<i>Proofs of fact cannot be overthrown, &amp;c. 1.</i>	17
<i>Proofs immediate stronger than mediate ones, 1.</i>	17
<i>Proofs which consider a thing in all respects stronger than those which consider it only in one, 1.</i>	18
<i>Proofs of ones eyes and senses more certain than those of ratiocination, 1.</i>	18
<i>Proofs of fact stronger than those of argumentation applied on the same fact, 1.</i>	22
<i>Prayers of good people according to the Greeks, help the damned, 1.</i>	279
<i>Proper Body, the meaning of it, apply'd to the Sacrament, 2.</i>	73
<i>Proper, and Properly are apply'd to Subjects wherein there is no propriety of substance, 2.</i>	75
<i>Proper has several significations, 2.</i>	75

### Q.

<i>Questions of right, how they ought to be decided, 1.</i>	9
<i>Questions of fact how they ought to be decided, 1.</i>	ibid.
<i>Questions of Faith ought to be decided by the Scripture, 1.</i>	ibid.
<i>Questions on the Eucharist, two, the first touching what we ought to believe of it, and the other touching what has been anciently held about it, 1.</i>	36
<i>Question touching the Greeks, is not whether they believe what we believe, but whether they believe what the Roman Church believes, 1.</i>	110
<i>Question of the possibility or impossibility of the change frivolous, 2.</i>	163

### R.

<i>Raban and Bertram have not oppos'd the Stercoranists, 2.</i>	253
<i>Reasonings of the Author of the Perpetuity, are at most but probabilities, 1.</i>	20
<b>Recapitu-</b>	

## A TABLE of the Matters.

Recapitulation at the end of the Greek Liturgy, wherein there is nothing said of Transubstantiation and the Real Presence, 1.	142
Receive Jesus Christ, and to be sanctified, according to the Greeks is one and the same thing, 1.	149
Receiving Jesus Christ is caused, say the Greeks, only by the good dispositions of the Soul, 1.	15
Revelation of Jesus Christ to S. Bridget, 1.	79
Rupert's opinion in the 12th. Century, 1.	288
Russians ignorant, 1.	70
Roman Church condemns not several Opinions which yet she does not approve, 1.	278

### S.

Sacraments ought to be establish'd immediately on the Word of God, Pref.	
Sacraments their number, not regulated by the Greeks, 1.	208
Sacrament and Mystery, what those terms signifie in the Writings of the Fathers, 2.	72
Sacrament may be considered, either in opposition to the thing. whereof it is a Sacrament, or conjoyntly with it, 2.	96
Sacrament in how many senses it may be said to be truly the Body of Jesus Christ, 2.	79
Samonas a suspected and doubtful Author, 1.	264
Scaliger's Colloquies, 1.	38
Sanctification of the Bread compared to the Dye which Wool takes, 1.	194
Seminaries for the Eastern People at Rome and elsewhere, 1.	103
Seminaries, the advantages which the Roman Church receive thence, 1.	104
Sense, its language not contrary to that of Faith on the subject of the Eucharist, 2.	67
Sense, its language literal, and without a figure: 2.	67
Sentiment real, of the Greeks touching the change which happens in the Eucharist, 1.	218
Sense metaphorical of a proposition to be oft received, 2.	111
Sense first and natural of these propositions, The Bread is the Body of Jesus Christ, &c. is the Sacramental one, 2.	157
Sense natural of Propositions is determined by the matter in question, 2.	158
Sense of our Saviours words perplexed by the Schoolmen, and Casuists of the Roman Church, 2.	101
Sense of our Saviour's words cannot be found out by the common people in the consent of all Churches, 2.	99
Sense particular, cannot be attributed to persons, who explain themselves only in general terms, 2.	123
Signs take their names from the things which they signifie, 2.	73
Synods of Cyril de Beroa and Parthenius against Cyril, supposed pieces, &c. 1.	210
Silence of the Greeks, from whence Mr. Arnaud takes his argument, has neither evidence, certainty, nor necessity, 1.	277
Silence of the Greeks concludes nothing, 1.	278
Sociniens interested against the Fathers, 1.	39
Stercoranists who they were, 2.	246
Stercoranists could not believe the Substantial Presence, 2.	248
Supplement which Mr. Arnaud pretends one should make to the expressions of the Fathers is absurd, 2.	68
Suppositions of what use in a dispute, 1.	4



## A TABLE of the Matters.

<i>Supposition which Mr. Arnaud makes, that the Real Presence was believ'd in the 7th. 8th. and 9th. Centuries is unreasonable and captious, 2.</i>	63
<i>Suppose we ought that in the 7th. 8th. and 9th. Centuries, neither Transubstantiation nor the Real Presence was held, 2.</i>	64

### T.

<b>T</b> erms metaphorical which use has made proper, 2.	11
Terms true and Truly are apply'd to several things, 2.	76
Theophylact's passages explain'd, 1.	399
Translator and a Paraphrast their difference, 1.	359
Treatise of the Perpetuity is a real mass of difficulties, 1.	36
Transubstantiation and the Real Presence, considered in a Church wherein they are held, 1.	41
Transubstantiation is the precise determination of the manner of the change of the Bread, 1.	120
Transubstantiation is not a speculative Doctrin, 1.	ibid.
Transmutatur and Transubstantiatur are not synonymous terms, 1.	124
Transubstantiation nor the Real Presence were the points which first separated the Greeks, 1.	245
Transubstantiation was not believ'd by several before the Council of Constance, 1.	288
Treatise of the Perpetuity very proper for persons that are curious and lazy, 1.	45
Treatise of the Perpetuity illusory in what it promises, 1.	ibid.
Turks favour those who gave them most Money, 1.	105

### V.

<b>V</b> irtue, Bread chang'd into the virtue of the Body of Jesus Christ according to the Greeks, 1.	233
Version of the New Testament of Mons, &c, 1.	145
Vicq. Fort Translator of Herbert's Voyages, 2.	41
Voyagers do not say that the Moscovites believe Transubstantiation.	

### W.

<b>W</b> ittembogard one of the chief of the Arminian party, 1.	39
Wicked in the sense of the Greeks receive not the Body of Jesus Christ, 1.	146
Word of the Gospel is truly the Body of Jesus Christ, 2.	78
Word of the Gospel more truly the Body of Jesus Christ than the Eucharist, 2.	78.
Words of Jesus Christ carry not our minds to the Real Presence by a primary idea, 2.	113

F I N I S.

ERRATA.

## ERRATA.

### PART I.

Page 7. read as already mention'd, for as I already mention'd, p. 9 l. 4. r. the for that, p. 12. l. ult. r. their for these, p. 34. l. 1. r. of for which, p. 38. l. 1. r. person for persons, p. 38. l. 45. r. manners for manner, p. 39. l. 13. r. critick for a critic, p. 46. l. 23. r. an for any, p. 57. l. 1. r. self for selfs, p. 90. l. 5. r. than for but, p. 95. l. 4. r. are no for yet no, p. 97. l. 1. r. altho schismatical for altho the schismatical, p. 11. l. 25. r. we shall see by for we shall by, l. 30. r. and which for and that which, p. 124. l. 40. r. Letins say for Latins says, p. 15. l. ult. r. his not inserting the Greek for soasmuch as he has not, p. 165. l. 1. r. which is for which most, 181. l. 25. r. rational for national, p. 203. l. r. wood for word, p. 210 l. 1. r. signs for sign, p. 213 l. 29. r. pursue for pursue, p. 225. l. 24. r. xpression for expressions, p. 243. l. 1. dele Preface, p. 153 l. 10. r. those that build, p. 355. l. 7. r. was not printed, p. 274. l. 14. r. and yet taste, p. 279. l. 17. r. silence on the rest for silence the rest, p. 291. l. 23. r. be-came not angry for became angry, p. 335. l. 35. r. only the Divinity, p. 330. l. 22. r. colours really for colours are really.

### PART II.

Page 6. at bottom of the page, r. and for where, p. 27. l. 11. r. Romanists persecuted for that persecuted, p. 47. l. 3 l. r. the union for of the union.

## The Printer to the Reader.

THE absence of the Translator, and his inconvenient distance from London hath occasioned some lesser Escapes in the Impression of this Book; The Printer thinks it the best instance of Pardon if his Escapes be not laid on the Translator, and he hopes they are no greater than an ordinary Understanding may attend, and a little Charity may forgive.

R. Royston.

## ADVERTISEMENT.

Rites of Funeral Ancient and Modern, in use thro the known World. Written Originally in French by the Ingenious Monsieur Muret. To which is added, *A Vindication of Christianity against Paganism*. All Translated into English by P. Lorrain. London, Printed for R. Royston, Book-feller to his Sacred Majesty, at the Angel in Amen-Corner, 1683.

### The Contents of the said Book.

THE Funeral Rites of the Egyptians.

Grecians.

Romans.

Persians.

Turks.

Chineses.

Americans.

Of some Islanders.

Of the Tartars.

Living Sepulchres.

Fiery Sepulchres.

Water-Burials.

Airy Obsequies.

Burials above Ground.

The Funeral Rites of the Ancient Jews.

Modern Jews.

Schismaticks.

Christians.

A Discourse concerning the Right of Burial, and Laws on that behalf.

THE END.

